

Vol. XXV.

APRIL, 1948.

No. 2.

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

CORRESPONDENCE: All correspondence should be addressed to Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 12/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque. Notice of change of address should be sent to the Manager.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Wellington, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. Brian Carmichael, Corinda, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Launceston, Tas.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Parnell, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—V. Rev. E. Glowrey, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Cairns—Rev. E. C. Clifford, O.S.A., Herberton, Q.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Three Springs, W.A.

Diocese of Goulburn—V. Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Waratah, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, N.Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Shepparton, Vic.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. H. Larkins, Wagga, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor: REV. T. VEECH,

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,

St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS .. Rev. W. Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.	89
Encyclical on the Sacred Liturgy—Reckoning of Time—Appeal of <i>Defensor Vinculi</i> —Recourse to Holy See through Legate—Duelling—Favour of Law enjoyed by Marriage—Use of New Psalter.	
THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE .. Rev. F. A. Mecham, B.A.	99
IS THE ACT OF PERFECT CONTRITION WITHIN THE REACH OF ALL? II. .. Rev. Austin Brennan, C.S.S.R.	108
PRIEST, PROPHET, AND KING Stanley B. James	116
MORAL THEOLOGY Very Rev. James Madden, D.D.	123
Reckoning of Time—Seal of Confession.	
CANON LAW Very Rev. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L.	132
Censure incurred by co-operation in abortion—Faculties to hear Confessions at sea—Bequest to professed Sister—Dispensation from multiple impediment of consanguinity.	
LITURGY Very Rev. James Madden, D.D.	138
Ceremonies at private Baptism— <i>Requiem</i> Mass on Sunday—Recital of <i>Domine non sum dignus</i> —Imposition of hand at Confirmation— <i>Benedictio Locī</i> —Use of Biretta—Prayers at <i>Requiem</i> Mass—Disposal of Ablutions.	
HOMILETICS Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D.	147
Instructions for Men: VI. Proof of Christ's Claims.	
NOTES	151
The Nuptials of the King, Psalm XLIV—Our Lady, Help of Christians—Judge Higgins and Arbitration.	
BOOK REVIEWS	165
<i>New Testament</i> (Ed. Arendzen)— <i>The Old Testament and the Future Life</i> (Sutcliffe)— <i>The Apocalypse of St. John</i> (Loenertz)— <i>Seven Words from the Cross</i> (Passionist Fathers)— <i>The Marriage Service and Nuptial Mass—Vintage</i> (Joyce-Prendergast)— <i>My Life is Mine</i> (Beattie)— <i>Miss Pennyfeather in the Springtime</i> (O-Faolain)— <i>The Road of Excess</i> (White).	

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Die 1a Aprilis, 1948.

Official Documents

PAPAL ACTS

ENCYCLICAL ON THE SACRED LITURGY

(*"Mediator Dei et hominum"*)

Owing to the length of this important document—which, however, is sure to appear soon in pamphlet form—it is quite impossible to give more than a limited summary of it.

In this Encyclical letter, beginning with the words *Mediator Dei et hominum*, the Pope follows up a line of thought which he initiated in the Encyclical on the Mystical Body in 1943. That Encyclical dealt with the constitution and internal life of the Body of Christ which is the Church; this one is concerned with the common worship of God exercised by the ecclesiastical body.

The introductory remarks at the beginning sketch the redeeming work of the Divine Mediator as a restoration of the order disturbed by the sin of Adam. Christ turned the human race once more to God in an attitude of prayer and sacrifice. Through the power of His Blood the redeemed now collaborate with the grace won for them, sanctifying themselves for the glory of God.

The Redeemer willed that the sacerdotal life inaugurated by His own prayers and sacrifice should continue in the Church. Hence the institution of a visible priesthood to offer the clean oblation everywhere.

The Mass, the Sacraments, the divine Psalmody of the Office are the three main things in the Church's liturgical life.

The Pope notes with pleasure the happy effects of the liturgical movement which has been promoted by many and especially under Benedictine influence during more than fifty years.

This Liturgical Apostolate has in many ways been encouraged by the Holy See. The Pope can show no favour to those who are apathetic towards it, but at the same time it is undeniable that there have been exaggerations and certain tendencies towards novelty which are harmful or even highly dangerous and therefore need authoritative correction. The spirit of equilibrium is most necessary. As it is in the Latin Church that these tendencies particularly manifest themselves the present Encyclical is chiefly concerned with the Latin Liturgy.

Unity in truth, unity in obedience to Pastoral authority, unity in the worship of God go together. The unity of the body is especially centred in the one bread of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

The fundamental duty of man is certainly that of directing himself and his whole life towards God. The virtue of religion must animate him. This duty is both personal and social, and belongs to the supernatural order to which man has been called by God.

We see the positive ordinances of God regarding the worship which the Hebrew people were to render to Him in a special place, through special ministers, with special rites, at special times, and surrounded by special circumstance of legal purity, liturgical vestments, and such like.

This preparatory worship of God was continued and perfected by the Word Incarnate, in virtue of whose will to carry out the precept of His Father we are all sanctified. From Christ comes the light that instructs, the pastoral authority that governs, the sacrifice and sacraments that sanctify the human race.

As our Advocate with the Father in heaven He carries on that work of sanctification through the Church with which He is indefectibly present throughout the centuries. The Church is the pillar of truth and the dispensatrix of the graces of redemption. The growth of the Church is the growth of Christ in a multitude of members, these members being built like living stones into a holy temple for the worship of God.

When therefore the Church offers, it is Christ that offers His one sacrifice; when the Church administers sacraments to sanctify souls she only uses instruments of grace in which Christ's power is operative; when the Church offers public prayer, Christ is in the midst of that number of individual persons gathered in His name. In a word, the Sacred Liturgy is the public worship which Christ our Redeemer as Head of the Church renders to the Father; it is the integral cult of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, Head and members acting as one.

This worship remains the same throughout the ages of time, although it enriches itself with a multitude of new rites according to the needs of changing circumstances. It accompanies and permeates the lives of the faithful from the baptismal font to the last anointing. It accompanies their bodies to a Christian grave where they rest in the hope of the final resurrection, while it also reaches out a helping hand to those who are detained in the expiatory fires of purgatory.

Because it is human and also social, Christian worship must be both internal and external. Visible rites are means to place the unity of the Mystical Body greatly in evidence, to stimulate its sacred enthusiasms, to gather together its strength and to intensify its action. But the essential element of all Catholic worship is internal; otherwise rites

and ceremonies become mere pieces of religious formalism. To regard the liturgy as something merely decorative, or as a system of decent ceremonial laws is to misconceive it. God is not honoured by lips pronouncing beautiful words but by hearts that seek perfection of life and sanctity.

It is true that the Eucharistic sacrifice and the sacraments have intrinsic efficacy, but certain new theories that exalt so-called "objective piety" and speak slightly of "subjective piety" are not to be favoured. Certain conclusions drawn from the idea of the corporate value of liturgical worship, inasmuch as they disregard personal piety and discourage private devotions, are false, insidious and harmful. The "opus operatum" which belongs to what Christ instituted and applies to souls should certainly be kept well in mind, but the need of personal dispositions should also be stressed. The work of redemption, though independent of our will, requires the effort of our souls in personal striving to attain salvation. We must keep up the active stand of the Christian soldier—*praesidia militiae christianae*. There is question not of excentric piety but of genuine personal devotion and spiritual practices that stimulate and add vigour to the soul in the pursuit of perfection. Everything that nourishes true fear and love of God is good. Piety penetrated by Christian faith and the precepts of Christian morality is necessarily organic and theocentric. Every department of life—private activity, conjugal fellowship, even economic and political action—must be filled with the spirit which the Church has from Christ. All Christian asceticism is a source of energy, and a disposition for drawing greater abundance of life from the Eucharistic sacrifice and the sacraments.

Thus there is no real opposition between private and public prayer, between ethics and contemplation, between ascetic life and liturgical piety, between jurisdiction and priestly ministry.

Undoubtedly liturgical prayer, being the public supplication of the royal bride of Jesus Christ, has special excellence beyond private prayers. But this greater excellence does not at all mean that these two kinds of prayer are irreconcilable opposites. They harmonize in the same spirit and in the identical aim "that Christ be formed in us".

The Liturgy being a testimony of the Church's faith and being a sacerdotal thing, must be regulated by the hierarchical authority of the spouse of Christ. It is invoked as a proof of dogmas, but does not create dogmas, as it were, by experimental process. The Liturgy develops, and in non-essentials conforms itself to the needs of the times; but the Supreme Pontiff alone has the right to make such changes in

present circumstances. Mass in the vernacular, arbitrary transference of established feasts, the exclusion of the Old Testament from the course of biblical readings are unauthorized abuses; and the same judgment falls on those persons who would revive the insane archaeologism of the Council of Pistoia, insisting on such returns to ancient usage as would oust the present form of altar, eliminate black from liturgical vestments, exclude images, cast out the representation of the pains of Christ crucified, have done with polyphonic chant.

*

*

*

*

The fountain and centre of the Christian religion is the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. This Mystery was instituted by the supreme Priest Jesus Christ and at His command is renewed perpetually by His ministers in the Church. Consequently it receives particular attention in this Encyclical.

The doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass is recalled in terms of exposition and comment which do not differ except in some points of added precision from the decree of the 22nd session of the Council of Trent. The Mass is identical with the Passion in all except the mode of offering—identity of one principal Priest now offering through priests who represent Him, identity of Victim, identity of ends. By the Mass the faithful enter into vital contact with the sacrifice of the cross, the merits of which are thus applied to them.

It is, therefore, necessary that the faithful should share in this Eucharistic sacrifice with the same sentiments that Christ had in offering Himself. As Priest He showed humble submission of spirit giving adoration, honour, praise and thanksgiving to the Sovereign Majesty of God; as Victim He showed that total self-immolation which is a model for our imitation in the spirit of self-abnegation, penance, sorrow for sin and expiation of it. Conformity to Him demands such a mystic death with Christ as the Apostle expresses in the words: "With Christ I am nailed to the cross".

Participation by the faithful in the Divine Sacrifice does not however mean that they are possessed of sacerdotal powers. The priest at the altar is not just a deputy of the community and they and he are not concelebrants. The truth is that the celebrating priest represents the people only because he represents Christ Who is the Head of all the members. The people do not represent the person of the Divine Redeemer; they are in no sense a Mediator between themselves and God, and cannot be said to have sacerdotal powers.

Nevertheless the faithful offer the Divine Victim. The ritual words themselves show this. The priest turning to the faithful calls the Mass "my sacrifice and yours"; the prayers are mostly worded in the first person plural. The baptismal character itself makes the faithful participants in their way in the priesthood of Christ.

They offer the Mass not merely in a more remote way because of their assisting at it, uniting their prayers with it, supplying the material elements; but they offer in a really more profound way. The bloodless immolation which is carried out by consecration and makes the Victim present on the altar is the work of the celebrating priest as representative of Christ and not as representative of the faithful. But in placing the Victim on the altar the priest presents Him to the Father as an offering to the glory of the Blessed Trinity and for the good of all souls. As the priest offers in the person of Christ the Head, all the internal worship of the members, especially of those here and now united to the sacrifice, goes up together to God. Thus the faithful united to their sacerdotal Head participate in the liturgical action.

But it must be well understood (in view of certain strange views) that the Mass, to be the social act of worship made by Christ (Head and members), in no sense needs the ratification of the people nor even the actual assistance of the people at its celebration.

In order that the oblation, whereby the faithful in the Mass offer the Divine Victim, should have its full effect, it is necessary that they immolate themselves as a victim. This immolation is not limited to the Liturgical Sacrifice only. The Prince of the Apostles calls all the living stones united to the Corner-stone a "holy priesthood" destined to offer spiritual victims; and St. Paul makes it clear that this spiritual service belongs to all times. But the spirit of mortification should be most energetically alive when the death of Christ is represented on the altar. "Through Him and with Him and in Him" is the grand formula of this oblation of self-immolation.

Worthy of all praise is the effort of those who promote the active participation of the faithful in the Mass by commending and spreading the use of the Roman Missal and by other means, in submission to the rulings of the Church. But it must be remembered that many are incapable of using the Roman Missal even in the vernacular. These can unite with the Holy Sacrifice other prayers or devotions which are easier for them and which, though different in form from the liturgical prayers, have the same ultimate scope. These things should be wisely and

prudently directed, and each diocese should have a special Committee to promote the liturgical apostolate.

The chief aim of participation in the Holy Mass—however varied its forms and circumstances—is the closest possible union with the Divine Redeemer and the daily sanctification of one's life for the glory of the heavenly Father.

*

*

*

*

The August Sacrifice of the altar ends with the communion of the Divine Banquet. But, as everyone knows, the integrity of the sacrifice requires only that the priest should communicate. Communion of the people is supremely desirable, but not necessary. Luther's proposition that a Mass in which the priest alone communicates is illicit was condemned by the Council of Trent.

So much is communion a participation in the actual sacrifice here and now offered that the faithful can lawfully and laudably desire to receive particles consecrated at that very Mass, although the practice of using hosts already consecrated and reserved in the tabernacle is common and not to be condemned.

Numerous communions of children and young people, of married couples, of workmen, of persons of every class is the great means of building up the unity of the mystical Body of Christ. Communion within the Mass and with hosts consecrated at the Mass should be the ideal; but the Church is condescending to those who for special reasons must communicate outside of Mass—before or after it. The prolongation of personal thanksgiving for some time after Mass is altogether commendable and is a practice of personal piety from which the faithful should not dispense themselves on the plea that it is not liturgical. In fact, this personal thanksgiving recommended by the Church is even necessary in order to receive the full grace of Holy Communion, that of remaining in Christ.

The adoration of the Blessed Sacrament follows from the doctrine of the Real Presence. Adoration of the Holy Eucharist in the sacrifice and in the act of communion was always practised, but gradually the development of Eucharistic cult in the Church introduced the practice of adoration distinct from the time of the sacrifice itself. The motive of such adoration is valid and solid, and the Church has encouraged its various forms—visits to the B. Sacrament, benediction, exposition, processions (all practices which powerfully augment the liturgical spirit). This cult of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament makes the people

feel the meaning of His word: "Come to Me, all you who labour and are burdened and I will refresh you".

*

*

*

* *

The ideal of the Christian life consists in this, that each one should unite himself intimately with God. Hence the worship which the Church renders to the Eternal. Set in the Eucharistic sacrifice and in the use of the sacraments, this worship is so ordered and disposed that with the divine office it extends to all the hours of the day, to the weeks, to the whole course of the year, to all times and all conditions of human life.

Gradually prayer at certain hours of the day and the night fixed itself in the practice of ascetic persons and monks, thus coming into the usual life of the Church. By the authority of the Church these prayers obtained liturgical dignity. Hence the Divine Office which is nothing else but the prayer of the Mystical Body of Christ addressed to God in the name of all Christians and on their behalf. Its acquittal is confided to priests, to other ministers of the Church and to Religious who are specially delegated. The dignity of this prayer is due to Christ Who introduced into the world the hymnody of heaven. His Spirit animates the Church which is His Body. The interior movement of our spirit should accompany that prayer, so as not merely to make perfect music or decorous ritual but such an elevation of our minds and souls to God as will consecrate all our actions to Him in Christ our Lord.

The Psalms, as everyone knows, constitute the chief part of the Divine office. Of these as distributed throughout the day in his own time Casiodorus says: They bless the coming day with morning jubilation, they dedicate for us the day's first hour, they consecrate our third hour, they diffuse joy on the sixth hour in the breaking of bread, they mark the end of our fast at the ninth hour, they conclude the day for us and at the coming of night they prevent our minds from getting dark".

As the Psalmody is the voice of the Church, the Pope recommends the revival of parochial Vespers. Sundays and feast days should be well observed; and with the decorous chanting of Vespers the faithful might well experience what St. Augustine said of himself: "How much I wept in the hymns and canticles, profoundly moved as I was by the sound of Thy Church sweetly singing. Those voices flowed into my ears and the truth dripped into my heart, and sentiments of piety burst forth, and tears flowed, and they did me good".

The Holy Father shows in detail what a wonderful course of spiritual pedagogy the Liturgical year holds. It is an admirable system of Christian formation in the School of Christ. And besides the mysteries of Christ there are the feasts of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, in which we contemplate a galaxy of Christian virtues in all their varied and splendid manifestations. The many feasts of Mary remind us that God wished us to have everything through her.

*

*

*

*

The fourth part of the Encyclical is taken up with details of admonition to the Episcopate. So-called extra-liturgical exercises of piety such as meditation, examination of conscience, the Rosary, the Way of the Cross, visits to the B. Sacrament, retreats, novenas, the month of May in honour of the B.V.M. and the month of June in honour of the Sacred Heart receive their due praise and recommendation, for they are helps to a fuller participation in the divine Liturgy. It is inadvisable to subject these to rigorous liturgical discipline, but the spirit of the Liturgy should inform them.

In view of attempts to discourage frequent confessions of devotion, the Holy Father reiterates his former instruction given in the Encyclical on the Mystical Body regarding the utility of this frequent and salutary recourse to the Sacrament of Penance.

No attempt should be made to interfere with just liberty in following one or other of the many ways of devotion under the instinct of the Holy Spirit, but a word of special recommendation is given to the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius because of their signal efficacy—repeatedly recognized by the Roman Pontiffs.

Furthermore every means of liturgical apostolate should be employed with zeal, full attention being given to decorum in the Church, music both gregorian and popular, its rightful place being assigned to modern music also. The same is to be said of architecture, sculpture and painting. All forms that serve piety are admissible. The liturgical spirit should direct the things of worship, and that spirit should be promoted by the spoken and written word and by congresses or liturgical weeks.

Erroneous tendencies to be guarded against are false mysticism, harmful quietism, exaggerated archaeologism.

A prudent zeal, always submissive to the guidance of the Hierarchy, will secure desirable progress and curb exaggerations. All should at all times remember that God is not a God of discord but of peace.

Liturgical apostolate should serve the formation of one heart and one mind in the children of the Catholic church.

* * * *

ACTS OF OFFICES

Papal Commission for the authentic interpretation of the canons of the Code

A.

I. *On the supputation of time.*

Query 1: Whether, having chosen one mode of reckoning time, one may change this mode by virtue of Can. 33 §1 in actions formally diverse?

Query 2: Are the three Masses celebrated in the night of the Lord's Nativity formally diverse?

Answer: Yes to the first; No to the second.

II. *On the appeal of the Defensor vinculi.*

Query: Whether, at the appeal of the Defensor vinculi (according to Canon 1987) against the second sentence confirming the nullity of a marriage, the Defensor vinculi in that further instance (even if there is question of an apostolic tribunal) may, according to his conscience, abandon the appeal made, so that the tribunal in this case should not have the right to impose the prosecution of the case on the Defensor vinculi who thus abandons the former appeal.

Answer: Yes.

Given at Rome from the Vatican City, May 29, 1947.

B.

I. *On recourse to the Holy See through a Legate of the Roman Pontiff.*

Query: Whether the clause of Canon 81: "Unless recourse to the Holy See is difficult", obtains as often as Ordinaries can easily recur to the Legate of the Roman Pontiff in their country, who is in communication with the Holy See?

Answer: No.

II. *On duelling.*

Query: Whether in those places in which judgement on a duel which is to be fought is reserved to a so-called tribunal of honour, those who challenge and those who accept incur the penalties of Canon 2351 by the challenge itself or by acceptance of it.

Answer: Yes, unless it is certain that the two parties had no intention of fighting a duel.

III. *On the favour of law enjoyed by a marriage.*

Query: Whether in the presence of a positive and insoluble doubt on the validity of a first marriage, a second marriage must, in virtue of Canon 1014, be declared invalid?

Answer: Yes, provided that the cause is defined in the ordinary course of law.

Given at Rome from the Vatican City, June 26, 1947.

M. Card. MASSIMI, *President*.

A. Coussa, Ord. Bas. Alepp., *Secretary*.

PAPAL BIBLICAL COMMISSION.

On the use of the New Psalter outside the canonical hours.

By a response of 22 October, 1947, the Pope extended the faculty of using the new Psalter in all prayers both liturgical and extra-liturgical, whenever there is question of whole Psalms to be recited or chanted outside of the Mass.

Rome, 22 Oct., 1947.

James M. Vosté, *Consultor Secretary*.

W. LEONARD.

The Philosopher's Stone

Summary: Link between alchemy and chemistry—the origins of alchemy, and its philosophical background—Dalton's atomic theory and the beginnings of modern chemistry—theory of Prout, the successor of the Greek cosmologists—classification of the elements—Thompson's electrical atom—the nuclear atom of Rutherford—Bohr and Sommerfeld apply Planck's quantum theory to the atom—further knowledge of the components of the nucleus—the first transmutations of elements—nuclear fusion with the liberation of energy—the philosophical question raised by the conversion of matter to energy.

The modern science of chemistry may seem to have little besides its name to link it with the alchemy of the ancients. The alchemist sought the philosopher's stone, which would change the base metals into gold; the search was fruitless, and no easy way to riches was discovered. Modern chemistry, on the other hand, has aims that are far different; it began in the opening years of last century, and has made astonishing progress. Yet there is a link between them, for among the achievements of chemistry has been the realization of the dream of the alchemists; gold has been made by man. Further, this advance of chemistry has opened up new fields for the consideration of the philosopher. And so a recent publication¹ of the philosophical faculty of the Catholic University of Louvain devotes considerable space to the story of chemistry.² A noteworthy feature of this excellent work is the clarification of the relations between cosmology and the physical sciences. This question has already been adequately treated in the *Record*,³ and the reader is referred to those pages for a clear exposition of the matter. The present article is not designed to traverse again the work done so admirably by Professor Renoirte, but rather to consider the pursuits of the alchemists, their modern realization in the transmutation of the elements, and the philosophical problems which arise from these facts.

Alchemy, in common with such varied gifts to man as alcohol and algebra, betrays its Arab blood by its prefix. Western Europe received alchemy from the Moors in Spain; the Moors in turn derived their knowledge from the Alexandrine Greeks. Europe of the 13th Century saw the convergence of two philosophical streams, the Christian tradi-

1. *Eléments de critique des sciences et de cosmologie*. F. Renoirte. Louvain 1945.

2. This sketch is taken as far only as 1935, possibly because the book represents notes written at that date; hence it does not treat such developments as the fission of uranium, and its consequences. Professor Renoirte promises us further works on cosmology, which we await with great interest.

3. *A.C.R.*, April, 1930, pp. 138-145, by Rev. Timothy D. Sullivan.

tion—it had been preserved in the monasteries, and in the episcopal schools which became the universities of Europe—and the Arabic contribution; so chemical knowledge, too, in that same century was the result of the mingling of the theories of the Arabs with the Western knowledge of the process of working metals; this knowledge had been got by the Roman artisans from the metallurgists of Egypt, and then preserved during the Dark Ages in the workshops of Italy and France. It is interesting that it was Berthelot, the lifelong friend of Renan, who provided this further evidence of the activity of these centuries; regarding the contribution from each of these two sources, it was his opinion that the part played by the Arabs was less than generally imagined. The alchemy of this time contained a great deal of true chemical knowledge.⁴ But above everything else it was centred round the theory that the base metals could be changed into gold and silver. The alchemists even claimed that they were effecting these changes; what they were doing by their chemical processes was colouring various substances white or yellow to resemble the noble metals. St. Albert the Great, with others, saw through such deceptions—he tested the gold for himself and found it wanting. St. Thomas⁵ dealt with the theological question of whether gold produced by alchemy could be sold as real gold; he decided that it depended on whether the so-called gold really possessed the true properties of gold. Many, however, believed that these wonderful transformations were taking place. Kings were ever ready to pay alchemists to keep at work, for the first to gain this new power would rule the world.

The basis of this belief that elements could be transmuted was a philosophical one—the Aristotelian conception of prime matter. Failing to grasp this metaphysical notion, the alchemist hoped that by taking away the distinctive qualities of a thing, he could arrive at prime matter; and adding to this the distinctive qualities of gold or silver, he would have his precious metals. Prime matter was early identified with mercury—not ordinary mercury, but “mercury of the philosophers”, i.e., the essence of mercury freed from the qualities represented by the Aristotelian elements, earth, air, fire and water. Sulphur was supposed to contain the qualities of gold and silver, and so had to be added to this prime matter; it was not, however, ordinary sulphur, but some principle connected with it, and this was the coveted philosopher’s stone,

4. e.g., about nitric acid, its combination with hydrochloric to form the powerful solvent which merited the title aqua regia, also the many facts described by St. Albert the Great in *De Mineralibus*.

5. *Summa Theologica* 2a2ae, Q.77, a 2.

or elixir. The theory was, therefore, that the metals were made of mercury and sulphur, gold of pure mercury and pure red sulphur, silver likewise of pure mercury, but with the addition of white sulphur; the base metals were made of impure mercury and sulphur. The task of the alchemist was then a twofold one; he must reach the essence of mercury, and he must find the missing materials that would provide him with pure red sulphur, and the pure white variety. These impossible tasks continued to be attempted until the beginning of the 16th century. Then alchemy was turned in the direction of healing, and dropped its prefix to become the chemistry we know. Belief in the possibility of transmutation lingered on, Newton held it for a while and Leibnitz also.

The beginning of the 19th century saw the atomic theory of Dalton. Among the Greeks, philosophical theories of atomism had been advocated by Democritus and Leucippus; they were popularized by Epicurus, and, among the Romans, by Lucretius; Gassendi in the 17th century revived this philosophical atomism. Dalton's theory was not a philosophical one; he claimed merely that bodies are composed of particles which are immutable in the sense that the powers of chemistry cannot change them. He was led to this theory by the laws relating to the volumes in which gases combine. He pointed out, too,—and in this he differed from the early atomists—that atoms of different kinds can combine with each other. Since according to this theory atoms of one kind could not be changed into another, it seemed that transmutation of elements was placed beyond the bounds of possibility.

A contemporary of Dalton, Amadeo Avogadro, suggested that atoms are not found in the free state, but that the smallest independent unit of matter, the molecule, is really composed of two or more atoms. His hypothesis was that the same quantity of any gas contains the same number of molecules. But almost fifty years were to pass before it won acceptance, on the advocacy of his countryman, Stanislao Cannizzaro. Only then was it possible to arrive at a satisfactory table of atomic weights. The oxygen molecule is arbitrarily⁶ fixed at 32, and a table of atomic weights relatively to oxygen is obtained. In every instance, the atomic weight worked out as a whole number, and as early as 1815 Prout had suggested that since all the elements were multiples of hydrogen (atomic weight, 1.) perhaps this element was the basis of

6. By giving it this value, the other elements were able to be expressed more simply than if any other number were used; a litre of oxygen weighs 1.4292 grs., of hydrogen .089 gr., of steam .8044 gr., so the relative molecular weight of hydrogen is 2, of water 18.

all others, and the answer to the speculations of philosophers from as far back as the dawn of wisdom, in Greece. For when philosophy first began, mens' minds were turned towards the visible world; they imagined that if they could discover the material from which the objects around them were made, they would have the complete explanation. Not being able to conceive any invisible principle, they looked for an explanation in the visible elements around them. Thus Thales, influenced perhaps by myths that had come from Egypt, where the Nile is the life-blood of the country, suggested that all things are made of water. Anaximenes made this universal substance air, and Heraclitus fire. So now, twenty-five centuries afterwards, it seemed that hydrogen was the substance from which all material things are made. Once again, transmutation of the elements appeared to be a possibility.

Prout's theory seemed to have been dealt a death blow when more accurate determination of atomic weights showed that many of the elements were not whole numbers; thus very early chlorine was found to have an atomic weight of 35.45. Accordingly, Jean Stas, the authority of the time on atomic weights, wrote in the sixties that Prout's theory was no more than an illusion. Atomic weights now became all important. It was found that if the elements were arranged in an ascending order of their atomic weights, similar properties recurred at regular intervals. Thus Newlands found that generally speaking every eighth element showed similar qualities, and on the analogy of the musical scale, formulated his law of octaves. He read a paper on this to a scientific congress in 1864, and it was received with scorn, the chairman asked him ironically if he had tried the effect of arranging the elements in alphabetical order. Yet five years later we find these principles of Newlands embodied in Mendeljeff's periodic table of the elements, and accepted by the scientific world. There were gaps in this table and one of the most interesting chapters in the story of chemistry concerns Mendeljeff's predictions about the nature of these missing elements, and the subsequent finding of them and the verification of his predictions. Of more importance in the search for the ultimate constituent of material things was the fact that certain elements could not be fitted harmoniously into the table of ascending atomic weights.⁷ At first it was presumed that mistakes had been made in calculating the atomic weights. When experiments had been repeated so often that

7. Thus argon (atomic weight 39.9) by its properties as an inert gas must be placed in the extreme right hand column of the table as number 18, while potassium (39.1) must be placed as the first of a new row as number 19. The position an element occupies in the table is called its atomic number.

all possibility of error was excluded, chemists came to the conclusion that something else besides weight was the determining factor in deciding the properties of material things.

All through the 19th century Dalton's conception of the atom held sway; it was what its name conveys, an indivisible particle of matter. A new view of the atom was introduced in the closing years of the century by Professor J. J. Thompson. He was a chemist by accident, for he was to be apprenticed to a firm of locomotive makers; while waiting to begin work, he sat for a scholarship at Cambridge, and at the second attempt was successful; eight years later, he was the professor of physics there. He died only half a dozen years ago, so his lifetime covered all the discoveries that have been made concerning the components of the atom. At one time many had believed that electricity was a fluid. Thompson, by his discovery of the electron, proved that electricity consists of particles. He considered that the atom was a sphere made up of an equal distribution of positive and negative charges throughout its volume. The negative charges were due to these particles called electrons; the source of the positive charges remained unknown. So the atom ceased to be the ultimate constituent of matter; the material world was seen to be electrical in nature, and if transmutation were to take place, it would be linked with electrical forces.

This model of the atom satisfied science for a short time. It was found, however, that if alpha particles⁸ emitted from radio-active elements were projected through atoms, occasionally one of these particles was deflected through a large angle; if the atom consisted of uniformly distributed particles, many of the incoming alpha particles should be deflected at a small angle. This led to a nuclear model of the atom, in which the positive charge is concentrated in a very small space,⁹ constituting the atomic nucleus endowed with mass. Those few alpha particles which were deflected were the ones which struck the nucleus. The nuclear atom was given to the world in 1911 in a paper written by Professor Rutherford. Few figures are so important to the history of chemistry; for he it was who a few years after this realized the scientific dreams of ages, and actually changed one element into another. Ernest Rutherford has for us this local interest also that he came from New Zealand. Leaving there on a scholarship when he was twenty-four, he went to Cambridge to work under Professor Thompson. His

8. An alpha particle is really the nucleus of a helium atom.

9. Thus in the case of hydrogen, the nucleus is one ten-thousandth of the diameter of the atom, and a hundred million of these atoms placed side by side would occupy only an inch!

research there was so outstanding that three years later he became professor of physics at McGill University, Montreal—Stephen Leacock was there then, just beginning his dual rôle of professor of economics, and master of nonsense writing. Rutherford returned to England a few years later, and first at Manchester, and later at Cambridge, where he succeeded his old master, he was responsible for outstanding scientific achievements. He had to a remarkable degree the power of gathering round him highly competent helpers¹⁰ and inspiring them with his own enthusiasm. He died ten years ago, and lies buried in Westminster Abbey.

The nuclear model of the atom owes two of its developments to the Danish chemist, Professor Neils Bohr. He was the first to suggest that the electrons revolve round the nucleus in orbits as a miniature solar system; thus they are prevented from being sucked into the nucleus by its strong positive charge. Further difficulties arose with regard to these electrons; they did not seem to obey the ordinary laws of physics with regard to oscillating bodies. Again it was Bohr, this time in conjunction with Sommerfeld, who supplied the answer; the quantum theory of Max Planck¹¹ was applied to the electrons. This theory is linked with that of Einstein on relativity as one of the revolutionary discoveries of physics this century. It says in effect that energy varies by abrupt leaps or quanta; a quantum is a parcel of energy; electrons obey special laws dictated by this theory, as the readings from X-ray spectra show.

This same year of 1913 saw the solution of a vexing problem in the discovery of isotopes. Dalton had made it a fundamental postulate that every atom of the one element was the same weight. It was now found that elements are composed of atoms which vary in weight, and our atomic weights are really only averages; these atoms, though differing slightly in weight, have the same properties and hence occupy the same place in the periodic table. So chlorine is composed of atoms of

10. Such as Moseley, whose brilliant work on X-ray spectra established the importance of atomic number, and its connection with the positive charge on the nucleus. He used these spectra as the basis of a periodic table that was not subject to the anomalies of Mendeljeff's table based on weights. Science suffered a tragic loss when, in the summer of 1915, he with so many of our noble lads met his death at Gallipoli.

11. News has come this month from Germany of the death of this great scientist. Renoirte (*op. cit.* p. 112) says he died in 1940; the mistake is no doubt due to the difficulty of obtaining reliable information during the war years. Professor Planck became a Catholic a few months before his death, and his conversion made a great impression in academic circles in Germany. During this war he caused a sensation by his lectures on modern trends in physics. "We must admit," he said, "that according to the results of atomic research, there is behind this real world another real metaphysical world, which though forever inaccessible to our senses, nevertheless does exist".

weight 35, and a few of weight 37, and this accounts for the fractional atomic weight of chlorine, 35.45. The isotopes were found to be whole numbers in every case; once again Prout's theory of a hundred years before seemed possible, and hydrogen might be the constituent of all other elements. In fact, when the hydrogen nucleus was isolated a few years later, it was proposed that it be called the prouton. The name that it did get, the proton or fundamental particle, perpetuates equally well the essential point of Prout's theory. The nucleus of an atom was then considered to consist of protons and electrons; the protons, bearing a positive charge, were about twice as numerous as the negatively charged nuclear electrons. The nucleus was thus positively charged, but the atom as a whole was neutral, because the orbiting electrons equalled the excess number of positive charges on the nucleus.¹² Atomic number, more important now than atomic weight, came to mean the number of excess positive charges on the nucleus, and upon this number the chemical properties depend.

We pass by the important discovery of De Broglie in 1925 that electrons, though particles, can sometimes act as waves, to come to the last stage in our knowledge of the components of the atom. For some years it was realized that the view that there are electrons in the nucleus was open to serious question; for they would set up magnetic conditions, and influence the outer electrons in a way not compatible with the lines of their spectra. Hence especially welcome was the discovery of the neutron in 1932. This was due to the English scientist Chadwick—he has the unusual distinction of having carried on his researches as an internee, when he was caught in Germany at the outbreak of World War I. The neutron is a particle of almost the same mass as the proton, but without any electric charge. The nucleus of an atom is composed of neutrons and protons only, so there is no longer any need to suppose that it contains electrons. Further, the neutrons and protons together make up the atomic weight for the mass of the electron is negligible, being about one two-thousandth part of the weight of a proton. The protons are responsible for the atomic number, the positive charges of the nucleus, and the chemical properties of the element. It can now be seen how isotopes have the same properties because they have the same number of protons, and how they differ in weight, because of a different number of neutrons. In every case, the number of electrons

12. Thus the usual chlorine atom of atomic weight 35 and atomic number 17 was considered to have a nucleus of 35 protons and 18 electrons, and outside the nucleus 17 electrons arranged in 3 concentric rings.

in the revolving rings will be the same as the number of protons, making the atom as a whole electrically neutral.¹³ No longer can it be held that Prout was right, and that hydrogen is the sole constituent of the mass of the atom; for every element, except hydrogen in its simple form, contains neutrons as well. Modern scientists consider that this scheme of the atom has been confirmed in so many ways that it has passed beyond mere theory.¹⁴

Coming back now to our original question, can one element be changed into another? Can the dream of the alchemists be made to come true, and real gold obtained? It was early realized that radio-activity is a form of transmutation; particles are emitted from the nucleus, e.g., of radium, and this goes on until all the radium is changed finally into lead. Thus radio-activity was seen to be something quite different from ordinary chemical reactions, which effect changes in the electrons, and not in the nucleus. But radio-active elements are unstable and disintegrate of themselves. Could transmutation be effected in the case of stable elements? In 1919, Rutherford provided the answer; he bombarded nitrogen with alpha particles and produced oxygen,¹⁵ and so artificial transmutation was a fact. After the discovery of the neutron it was used as a bombarding particle and many transmutations were effected. The production of artificial gold offered no special difficulty. A piece of platinum was bombarded for several hours by high speed deuterons (isotopes of hydrogen); a radio active isotope of platinum was then formed, and this disintegrates to give gold.¹⁶ The reason why this making of gold created no stir was be-

13. So chlorine is now regarded as consisting of 17 protons—giving it therefore the 17th place in the table of elements—with eighteen neutrons for the lighter isotope, and twenty for the less frequent heavier one; outside the nucleus, there will be 17 electrons in each case. These isotopes are expressed as $^{35}_{17}\text{Cl}$ and $^{37}_{17}\text{Cl}$, the upper figure giving the atomic weight, the lower the atomic number. Likewise a hydrogen nucleus or proton is ^1_1H ; a helium nucleus, or alpha particle ^4_2He ; a neutron ^1_0n ; an electron $^0_{-1}\text{e}$.

14. It must be remembered that science can never tell us that the particles it has discovered are really the ultimate ones. It can tell us that a body is composed, but not that it is simple. At present, scientific interest is focussed on the particles of the mysterious cosmic rays.

15. Really, a rare isotope of oxygen, a proton was liberated as well.

$^4_2\text{He} + ^{14}_7\text{N} \longrightarrow ^{17}_8\text{O} + ^1_1\text{H}$.

16. The first stage: $^{196}_{78}\text{Pt} + ^2_1\text{H} \longrightarrow ^{197}_{78}\text{Pt} + ^1_1\text{H}$

then radio-activity: $^{197}_{78}\text{Pt} \longrightarrow ^{197}_{79}\text{Au} + ^0_{-1}\text{e}$.

The electron which is emitted must not be thought of as originally in the nucleus but it is formed and liberated by the change of a neutron to a proton $^1_0\text{n} \longrightarrow ^1_1\text{H} + ^0_{-1}\text{e}$. This proton moves the platinum up one place in the periodic table to become gold.

cause it has no economic value; it would need 10^{10} years to get 1 gr. of gold at enormous expense!

In 1939 a new discovery startled the scientific world. Hitherto the transmutations had been between elements close to each other in the periodic table. In January of that year Hahn and Strassman reported from Berlin that they had succeeded in splitting the uranium nucleus into two smaller nuclei, one of which was barium, with the liberation of tremendous amounts of energy.¹⁷ Thirty years before Einstein had formulated his theory of relativity, which demands that mass can be converted into energy.¹⁸ This theory was used to explain the stability of an atom. It was found that the elements, or at least their separate isotopes, were whole numbers; this could be explained if of proton and neutron each had the value of unity; but as a matter of fact both the protons and neutrons are a fraction over unity; as the total weight of neutrons and protons is always a whole number, these fractions have disappeared, and must therefore have been changed into energy, which serves to bind them into a stable whole. Also, the same theory was used with regard to the sun, to answer the age-old query of what is the fuel for that colossal furnace that provides such amounts of heat and light.¹⁹ It seemed then that the theory of Einstein was true, and there were cases in which mass was converted into energy. The fission of uranium, by converting neutrons into energy, furnished the certain proof.

To the philosopher falls the task of interpreting the facts of chemistry. The ordinary chemical reactions present no difficulty to the advocate of hylomorphism. In material substances, such as iron, gold, oxygen or hydrogen,—*materia secunda* is the term used to describe them—there is a determinable principle, which was called prime matter by the ancients, combined with a form, or determining principle. When a substantial change takes place, e.g., of hydrogen and oxygen into water, the determinable principle remains the same, the forms are changed. Even in the transmutation of elements, the philosophical explanation remains the same, and as we have seen, it was the basis of the speculations of the alchemists. Ordinary chemical changes effect

17. Uranium is composed of 3 isotopes: the rare intermediate one is the best suited for fission, and was the one used in the atom bomb. It took the Allies years, and Germany failed altogether, to get enough of it for a bomb.

18. Einstein's formula was $E = mc^2$ where c = the speed of light, thirty billion centimetres a second. If all the mass of 2 lb. of coal were converted into energy, the amount of such energy produced would be equal to the total output of Bunnerong working at its maximum for twenty-five years.

19. If ten per cent. of the hydrogen of the sun were being transformed into helium, there would be enough energy liberated to provide the sun's rays for ten thousand million years.

a fresh arrangement of the electrons, under the influence of a new form; in the case of radio-activity and artificial transmutations to neighbouring elements it is the arrangement of the neutrons and protons which is changed. But when we have nuclear fission with the liberation of energy, we are told there is annihilation of matter and the creation of energy. This is not really so, but the matter is changed into energy. True change requires a permanent subject, in which the change can take place. In every material change it is the determinable element which remains; in ordinary chemical changes, and in transmutations of elements without the liberation of newly produced energy, the forms are of the one class, they are all static. Now in the conversion of matter into energy, the determinable element of matter remains as always, but this time the resultant form is of a new class, it is a dynamic form. The metaphysical conception of determinable and determining principles underlies every physical change.

F. MECHAM.

October, 1947.

Is the act of Perfect Contrition within the reach of all?

Summary: In the first part of this article (A.C.R., October, 1947, pp. 277-284) the supposed difficulty of making an act of perfect contrition was discussed—It was claimed modern theologians teach that perfect contrition is within the reach of all men of goodwill—Views of moral theologians—Two ways of obtaining grace after sin—Confession with, at least, attrition and perfect contrition with implicit desire of sacrament—Reasons why confession is a more secure method—Application of doctrine defended to practical cases—Arguments for supposed difficulty not valid—Christ instituted confession in His mercy and love—yet that does not prove God cannot welcome a sinner, who seeks Him by way of perfect contrition—Degree of intensity required—Detestation of sin above all other evils for the love of God—Desire of eternal happiness not a bar to perfect contrition—Fruits of doctrine—Growth of spiritual life among faithful—Habit of making acts of sorrow—Important remedy for those who have sinned mortally—Security against eternal damnation—Preachers should warn sinners that a life of sin makes sincere repentance difficult—Conclusion.

Moral Practice.

We now turn to moral theology where the subject of perfect contrition is naturally an important one. Moral theologians always recognise two ways in which a sinner may recover the state of grace, namely, by way of attrition plus the sacrament of Penance and by way of perfect contrition, which will include a desire, at least implicit, of sacramental absolution. Moreover, they take it that a sinner sincerely seeking to recover God's grace in either of these ways may be confident of having obtained the divine mercy; so much so that he may always act upon this assumption. They do, indeed, describe the way of confession as being more secure; and this is, of course, true in so far as actual reception of the sacrament will bring justification to the sinner in the event of his not having dispositions more perfect than those of faith, hope and attrition. To this extent confession is safer and provides the sinner with an added reason for confidence. But we must remember that even when he has been to confession he has no more than a broad moral certitude of having recovered the divine friendship. For no one without a special revelation from God can at any time have strict certitude of being in the state of grace. Therefore, sacramental absolution does not warrant a certitude essentially different from that which the sinner may have when he seeks God's forgiveness in an act of perfect contrition.

Let us now note some practical cases in the solution of which these principles are applied. When theologians treat of what is required in

a minister of the sacraments in order that he may lawfully perform his sacred functions, they teach that he is bound to be in the state of grace. If, therefore, a priest, conscious of having committed mortal sin, is called upon to administer the sacraments, he is bound first to recover the divine friendship. The Roman Ritual,¹⁵ and theologians also, allow him to do this in either of the two ways mentioned above. Obviously, they take it that a priest who is sincerely contrite may prudently believe that he has recovered the state of grace. They do, indeed, add that, if circumstances permit, it is becoming that the priest should go to confession. This is clear; for one who has perfect contrition intends to seek sacramental pardon in due course, and it is well if he take the first favourable opportunity. Besides, as we have seen, the sacrament gives added security, which a true penitent will wish to have. We must not fail to notice an important exception to the norm of acting laid down above. But, while we note its importance, we must remember that it is an exception to the general rule. This is the case where a priest, conscious of mortal sin, wishes to celebrate Mass. In this case there is a special law binding him to go to confession before he celebrates.¹⁶

The question of how to get into the state of grace recurs when theologians are treating of what is required for fruitful reception of the sacraments. If a sinner wishes to receive a sacrament of the living, for example, the sacrament of confirmation, he is bound first to recover the state of grace. Once again theologians allow that this may be done in either of the two ways; and again there is the important exception, the case of one who wishes to go to Holy Communion, and who is bound by a special law first to approach the sacrament of Penance.¹⁷ When there arise cases of doubt as to whether or not a person has lost the state of grace, theologians continue to apply the same norms of acting. Take the case of such a person who finds himself in the proximate danger of death. What is he bound to do? Since he has no necessary matter for confession, no certain obligation of confessing has arisen. But the possibility of being in a state of mortal sin remains, and also the consequent danger to his eternal salvation. In the circumstance the natural law obliges him to use all moral diligence to secure that he is actually in the state of grace. Theologians say that he can fulfil this obligation by having recourse to an act of perfect contrition. Obviously they consider there is no reasonable doubt about his ability to make

¹⁵Tit. I, n. 4.

¹⁶Cf. can. 807.

¹⁷Cf. can. 856.

such an act. Again, suppose a person with the same doubt as to whether he has lost the state of grace wishes to say Mass or receive Holy Communion. The doubtful sin does not bring the law of confession into operation; but it does give rise to the obligation of making morally sure of being in the state of grace. According to the theologians this obligation can be fulfilled by an act of perfect contrition.¹⁸

To sum up. From the doctrine that God commands us all to make acts of charity, as also from the doctrine that He gives sufficient means of salvation to all men, we conclude that acts of charity and of perfect contrition are well within the reach of all those who sincerely wish to make them. We note further that moral theologians take this for granted, and base upon it the solutions they give to important practical cases that frequently occur.

ARGUMENTS FOR SUPPOSED DIFFICULTY NOT VALID.

What follows from the necessity of confession?

We have seen that from the necessity of confession some have concluded that to get into the state of grace by way of perfect contrition is very difficult and very insecure. The conclusion, however, is not warranted. For argument's sake, let it be supposed that perfect contrition were actually very difficult, and also that God in His mercy wished to make the way of salvation more secure for the sinful descendants of Adam and Eve. Certain it is that He could have come to our rescue without making use of sacraments at all, much less of any particular sacrament. For He is always able to do immediately what He is at present pleased to do through sacramental instruments. Therefore, even if it were difficult for the sinner to have perfect contrition, this would not be the reason why Christ instituted confession and made it necessary for his salvation. The reasons why our Lord instituted the sacraments—as far as we know them—are to be found in their wonderful suitability as means of human sanctification. The reason why he instituted the sacrament of Penance in particular is to be found in the fact that, being a judicial process, it is so well adapted for its special purpose of remitting human sins and of securing the reformation of the sinner. In this sacrament the sinner is instructed in the way of salvation; he is admonished and exhorted by the confessor in the name of Christ, the chief pastor of souls; and when he receives absolution he receives what his human nature craves for—a visible and efficacious sign of God's pardon. The fact that Christ instituted confession and

¹⁸Cf. e.g. Lehmkuhl, Vol. II, n. 205. Aertnys-Damen, Vol. II, n. 300.

commands all the faithful who fall into serious sin to approach this sacred tribunal certainly does prove His overflowing mercy and His tender solicitude for their salvation. But it does not prove that God cannot or will not stretch forth His merciful hand to the sinner who sincerely seeks His friendship by way of perfect contrition.

Is great intensity required?

Like other supernatural acts, perfect contrition, while always remaining what it is, may be found in various grades of intensity or as having varying degrees of fervour. The acts of virtue performed by the saints are essentially the same as those of the average Christian, but they far excel them in fervour and intensity. Now we ask: is a high degree of intensity required in the act of perfect contrition in order that it may bring about the remission of sin? We have said that formerly some theologians thought that it was. This opinion, however, has been abandoned. Nowadays theologians are quite certain that no particular degree of intensity is necessary. Even in its lowest degree of fervour it is still an act of perfect contrition. We must be careful, therefore, not to confuse an act of perfect contrition with a perfect act of contrition, which would be an act of utmost intensity and fervour and would be the effect of special grace. When discussing the teaching of the Roman Catechism on this matter, Father Slater writes: "However great the authority of the Catechism of the Council of Trent may be, it is well known that there are in it points of doctrine which have no greater weight than has a theological opinion. I may instance what the Catechism says about the necessity of confessing the circumstances of sin which only aggravate its malice, but do not change its nature . . . The common teaching nowadays is that no special degree of intensity is required in the act of contrition provided it be a detestation of sin above all other evils for the love of God".¹⁹

Must self-interest be excluded?

When a sinner is seeking justification by way of perfect contrition, is it necessary that his approach to God should be altogether selfless in its motives? The answer is emphatically no. From philosophy we learn that every being tends to its own proper end and perfection. Man is no exception. Being free, he can make the mistake of seeking his ultimate happiness where it is not to be found, namely, in created things. This is what he does when he commits mortal sin. But even when man sins, he is still pursuing what he takes to be his own perfec-

¹⁹*Irish Eccles. Record*, 1914, Vol. 2, p. 226.

tion and happiness. Nor is it possible that he should ever do otherwise. For this love of one's own good, this tendency to perfection, is not only a law of his human nature, it is the law of all being. Therefore, to desire our own eternal happiness is not only not incompatible with the love of charity and of perfect contrition, but it is the very foundation of this love.

Again we might argue that if the love of pure charity and of perfect contrition excluded all self-interest, it would exclude hope from the Christian soul. Hope would be incompatible with charity. Not only is this not so, but charity is built upon hope. We can only love God above all things for His Own sake because we desire Him and hope to possess Him as our own Ultimate Good. The errors of Quietism have been condemned by the Church on more than one occasion. One of the condemned propositions is as follows: "There is a habitual state of the love of God which is pure charity without any admixture of the motive of self-interest. Neither fear of punishments nor desire for rewards have any further part in it. God is no longer loved for the sake of merit, or perfection, or for the happiness to be found in loving".²⁰ When spiritual writers describe the work of sanctification as a process of dying completely to all self-love in order that the love of God may reign supreme, they must be understood as speaking of that inordinate self-love to which fallen man is so prone, and not of that true love of self to which we are obliged by the precept of hope. And when saints speak as if they were indifferent to their own eternal welfare, and were willing (if it were possible) to sacrifice it for the glory of God and the salvation of their brethren, their words must be understood with moderation and in no sense inconsistent with the virtue and the precept of Christian hope.

Must we prescind from the manifestations of God's goodness?

The answer is again no. Not only do we not need to do so, but we cannot do so even if we would. The divine goodness can only motive our acts of virtue in so far as it becomes known to us. We learn to know the goodness of God by meditating upon its manifestations, especially in the mysteries of the Crib, and the Cross, and the Altar and the Tabernacle. This brings us to the question: Have we charity and perfect contrition when we love God and are sorry for our sins because God has loved us and poured out His goodness upon us? In replying to this question, theologians appear to speak differently.²¹

²⁰Denzinger, n. 1327.

²¹Cf. e.g. Merkelbach, Pesch, *De Caritate*. Also de la Taille, *A.C.R.*, 1926, p. 85.

If there is any real difference between them it is a purely theoretical one. Some take a strict view of the question and say that if we love God purely and simply because He is good to us, and just in so far as He is good to us, our act is one of gratitude; and an act of gratitude flowing from the virtue of religion (part of the infused moral virtue of justice) is not formally an act of the theological virtue of charity. But these same theologians go on to point out that when a soul is grateful to God on account of His wonderful benefits it is very near indeed to loving Him for His own sake, and, in practice, it will pass on naturally and almost automatically to the act of charity.²² In our relations with our fellow men gratitude normally and very easily develops into the love of benevolence and of friendship. The same thing takes place in our relations with our divine Friend. For when a soul is animated by gratitude towards God, how will it—when expressing that gratitude—stop short of the very thing that above all else God asks for in return for His benefits, the love of friendship? If, when thinking of God's goodness towards itself, the soul is moved to sorrow for sin and the desire to make reparation, how will it hesitate to offer the most acceptable of all reparations, that of perfect contrition? Therefore, given God's grace, which will not be wanting, and the goodwill of the sinner, gratitude and the desire of reparation, which have been aroused by the thought of God's benefits, will most easily expand into the love of charity and the sorrow of perfect contrition.

THE FRUITS OF THIS KNOWLEDGE.

We have seen that the prejudice about the difficulty of perfect contrition is injurious to the sanctification and salvation of souls. We now note that if, on the other hand, the faithful realize that acts of perfect contrition are well within their reach, their spiritual life will profit immensely thereby. There is, happily, a large number of souls who live habitually in the grace of God, and who desire to love the Sacred Heart and to make reparation to It for their own sins and for those of the whole world. Greatly will they increase the glory of that Heart and advance the work of their own sanctification if they set themselves with confidence to multiply acts of loving sorrow.

Then, there are those who are tormented by doubts and by scruples as to whether they have lost the state of grace. Their number, too, is legion. If they will but pray for the grace of perfect contrition, and, reflecting on God's love and goodness as revealed in the Sacred Heart

²²E.g. Prümmer, *Tom. I*, n. 554.

of His Incarnate Son, set themselves to make acts of love and of sorrow based on love, they may be quite confident of enjoying the friendship of their Saviour and their God. If they wish, they may with a good conscience continue to receive Holy Communion every day, and enjoy the sacramental visits of their divine Friend. We do not forget, of course, that confession is a still greater source of help and consolation for many such souls, and that it is recommended by theologians. But we are thinking of those for whom confession is not possible, or even not convenient, and of some who are scrupulous, and to whom, perhaps, confession is not to be recommended.

Finally, those who have definitely fallen into serious sin should bethink themselves of the great remedy that is always within their reach, and which, if they used it, will give them security against the danger of eternal damnation. Having had recourse to this remedy, they should be filled with holy confidence; and thus strengthened, they should continue diligently to confirm and to increase the spiritual life of their souls. If a priest has certainly or probably fallen into mortal sin, and is called upon to baptise, or to hear confessions, or to administer the last sacraments, he may fit himself for these holy functions by sincerely exciting in his soul sentiments of perfect contrition; and this will suffice even though an opportunity presents itself of going to confession. It will be a good thing, of course, if he take that opportunity, but he is not bound to do so. Before celebrating Mass, however, a priest conscious of having sinned mortally must go to confession, no matter how contrite he may believe himself to be. If there is no opportunity of going to confession, and he has to carry on his priestly duties including the saying of Mass, he should have recourse to perfect contrition and then, confident of being in the state of grace, he should proceed with a good conscience and with peace of mind. He should not look upon the Masses that he celebrates and the sacraments that he administers as if they were so many new sins which will need to be confessed. When he is able to approach the sacrament of Penance and examines his conscience with a view to confession, he finds but one sin, already forgiven through perfect contrition, but still waiting for the opportunity to be confessed and sacramentally absolved.

A REAL DIFFICULTY.

We should not forget that many sinners have a real difficulty in coming back to God. It is the difficulty of being completely sincere, of having a true purpose of amendment. It arises from evil dispositions

and vicious habits contracted by frequency of sin. But this difficulty is common to imperfect and perfect contrition. The sinner must surmount it even before he goes to confession. Preachers do well to warn those who think that they can live a life of sin and easily have true repentance at the end. Such sinners make sincere repentance difficult for themselves, and it will be difficult even with the help of the sacraments. The point we have been making up to the present is this: granted the sincerity of true attrition, the sincerity that a man must have before he is worthy to go to confession, there is then no notable difficulty in reaching out to the higher motive of charity and of perfect contrition.

CONCLUSION.

We may well put our conclusion in the words of some great modern theologians. Cardinal Billot writes: "How often when alone have I not reflected that, though beyond doubt much good is done by frequent sermons on confession, yet there is something which it is more necessary to teach, to recall to memory, to insist on and to infuse into the daily lives of the faithful, something, however, to which little attention is paid, if, in truth, a thought is ever given to it, namely, perfect contrition".²³ "All Christians", writes Father Lehmkuhl, "should be solidly instructed concerning the extent and efficacy of an act of perfect charity, and of perfect contrition. It is a matter of incalculable importance for the time of their own death, and for that of others at which they may be present. No one should forget this truth while in health, and in time of sickness and danger of death it is all the more important . . ." "Could I speak throughout the whole world", Cardinal Franzelin used to say, "of nothing would I speak more frequently than of perfect contrition".²⁴

AUSTIN BRENNAN, C.S.S.R.

²³Pref. to *Perf. Contrition*, Von den Driesch.

²⁴Quoted by Father Halpin, p. 5.

Priest, Prophet, and King

It is a commonplace in the history of sociology that the functions of leadership afterwards divided were, at first, united in the same person. The patriarch of the tribe was also he who offered sacrifice, embodied in his pronouncements the spirit of his people and led them in battle. By him the wholeness of the tribal life was maintained. The integrity thus established was the source of its healthfulness and vigour. The principle is illustrated pre-eminently in the earlier stages of Hebrew history. On this point the biblical narrative is in complete agreement with the sociologist. Abraham summarises in himself as leader the entire life of the clan. The fatherhood he exercised was a comprehensive one. Though Moses shared his responsibilities with Aaron, it is he who, in the first place stands before God on behalf of his people and, as their priest, offers himself as atonement for their transgressions, combining with this truly sacerdotal character the functions of prophet and king. It is with Samuel that the cleavage begins. In the mists of that distant past to which he belongs, he can be discerned as in very truth the father of his people. The altar at which he sacrifices is their central shrine. It is he who anoints and commissions those who lead them against their enemies. The reins of government are exclusively in his hands. When Israel asks him to give them kings so that they may be as other peoples, he warns them of the dangers which this separation of functions involved. A monarch who is neither priest nor prophet will subject them to tyranny. Ultimately he yields and pours the sacred oil on the head of Saul.

The change is momentous. However inevitable it may have seemed, an inevitability due to the growing complexity of the national life, it marks a stage on the road to the fatal division between sacred and secular. But the immediate effects scarcely seem to justify Samuel's fears; it would have been difficult to persuade a Jew that the reigns of David and Solomon were anything but glorious. And, as a matter of fact, a division of functions does not necessarily involve the break up of the community's integrity. It is still possible that a spiritual interdependence shall maintain the Reign of God. But this interdependence under God is absolutely essential to the life and well-being of His People. Wholeness is as important for communal health as for that of the individual. Here, as in the physical sphere, disintegration is the sign of death.

But, on the other hand, danger may arise through the suppression, resulting from the domination of a particular office, of other functions. Thus, it came about in the later history of Israel that the overwhelming power of the priesthood, assuming complete control of the national life, crowded out the prophet. As the importance of the Temple in Jerusalem increased, so did the spirit of prophecy decline. There was unity, but a unity achieved at the expense of functions, other than the sacerdotal, essential for the life of Israel. The Temple became like one of those growths which mark disease in the physical body. This pseudo-centrality was a sign not of life but of death. Spirituality was choked by an exotic multiplication of ritual. Like some tree under whose dense branches no other vegetation can survive, the visible forms of worship so overshadowed the ground that the seer and oracle perished. Instead of interdependence, we find a single office monopolising the whole religious life of Israel. The deepening crisis found no spokesman to relieve the situation as other, previous crises had been relieved by the voice of an Isaias or a Jeremias. Spiritually the soil under this far-reaching shadow was barren. Or rather, it saw the development of unhealthy fungi, in the form of Scribes and Pharisees. Illustrating the truth of the saying, *corruptio optimi pessima est*, the complicated legalism for which they were responsible was the fruit of a decaying prophetism. Scribe and Pharisee signified the decease of a class which had been the glory of Israel. In proportion as the prophet died out, these increased. As the creative spirit lost its vigour, the parasites who battered on the writings left by the seers gained in strength. The legalism with which our Lord had to contend was a parasitical growth.

Its effect was to so weaken the spiritual life of Israel that it was no longer possible to enjoy political independence. The role of kings thus fell into abeyance. Prophet and monarch vanished at the same time and from the same cause. The cancerous growth of an ambitious and secularised sacerdotalism killed both. To restore the balance and create a healthy spirituality it was necessary for God Himself, in His Own Person, to intervene and to bring into being a New Israel.

In Jesus Christ we find restored the original unity as it existed in the patriarchs, but on an infinitely higher level. In Him are combined in an harmonious whole the functions of priest, prophet and king. He is perfect in each and in the blending which makes them one. A certain order, however, is observable in which these different roles were revealed. At the beginning of His ministry He went forth preaching the Kingdom of God, the traditional theme of the pro-

phets with whom common opinion associated Him. It was from this starting point that His contemporaries approach a fuller understanding of Him, and it is significant that it is from the same angle modern Jewry is beginning to discover His significance. When His power was more fully manifested, however, He was hailed as Son of David, and it was as "King of the Jews" that, after a royal entry to Jerusalem, He was crucified. The priestly significance of His Death on the Cross was not fully realised till after He was risen and ascended. His questioning of His disciples as to what was said concerning Him brought out the variety of answers given by popular opinion, but St. Peter summed up all in the comprehensive and epoch-making reply: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God." The character thus ascribed to Him by the chief among His following is like the sunlight which the prism splits into various hues. It signifies in a few illuminating words all that is conveyed by the terms, Priest, Prophet and King.

The fulness of Christ was imparted to the Primitive Church. It might be called its distinguishing characteristic. It is this which marks out those called to the leadership of the Church. They were priests, preachers and pastors, the equivalent, under the new dispensation, of priests, prophets and kings. They offered the Holy Sacrifice, they proclaimed the message and, as those who directed affairs, they were "princes in Israel." This combination seems almost the distinguishing mark of the Apostle, and is particularly observable in St. Paul. As represented by him, the Apostolic Church is authoritarian, sacerdotal, and prophetic, exhibiting these features in just proportions. Perhaps the claim for him of the prophetic vocation is the only one which will provoke dissent. The word is so soaked in Old Testament associations that, for those who have not realized the continuity between the two Dispensations, it will be difficult to apply it in the case of one who so emphatically belonged to the new order. Yet a prophet assuredly St. Paul was, and without any illegitimate and fanciful stretching of the term. He went to the Nations on the impetus of a vision which had given him the meaning of contemporary history. His predecessors had confined themselves mainly to Israel, but he went to the Babylon of his time with the proclamation that the Nations of the West together with the whole world were called to repentance and the acceptance of Baptism that they might be grafted into the stock of Abraham. But this difference denotes no more than the fulfilment of what the ancient seers had foretold. Nor was it merely a message to individuals. Like the prophets that were

before him, he preached to men as citizens of a specific society, as men incorporated with a doomed civilisation. Unfortunately the controversial use made of his writings has led to his being regarded as a theologian, thus obscuring the fact that he belonged to the same class as Osee and Ezechiel. Paul supplied the material for a theology, but he was not himself a theologian. It was no system that he presented to his hearers and readers but a message the very urgency of which forbade systematisation and compelled him to pour out his thought in a manner which was often the reverse of systematic. It was not as a student conning manuscripts in the silence and remoteness of a library that he accomplished his work but as a dynamic personality, an agitator hurrying from city to city and everywhere challenging the existing order and proclaiming a spiritual and moral revolution.

This character was representative of the young Christian Society. There was no danger of a too close alliance with Caesar nor was there any possibility of compromise with the dominant paganism. The Church was an alien element, aggressive and confident, in the surrounding civilisation, which it had to conquer or perish. Its forces were mobile, its thought not yet fixed in clearly defined terms.

It was impossible, of course, that this reformist or rather revolutionary spirit should continue at the same high temperature. Nor was it desirable that it should do so. Institutionalism has its claims. The needs of hierarchical order are imperative. Doctrine must be crystallised in dogmatic statements that can stabilise the Faith in accordance with the Revelation received.

In course of time, however, the balance between institutionalism and prophetic ferment tilted in favour of the former. Rigidity was prevented by the emergence of new religious orders under the leadership of spiritual genius. A St. Benedict, a St. Dominic and others arose to provide safety valves for spiritual energy. The danger came when these movements themselves became static. To describe the process which prepared the way for the break that occurred in the sixteenth century would of course require not an article such as this but a book. It will serve our purpose best if we summarise what happened in one country by quoting the words of a Catholic writer on whose judgment reliance can be placed. In an Essay on William Langland, the English medieval poet, author of *The Vision of Piers Plowman*, Christopher Dawson wrote thus:

“For the English Church never really recovered from the crisis of the fourteenth century. The next age was an age of moral and

spiritual decline. We had no San Bernardino to restore the old alliance between the Papacy and the party of reform, and no St. Joan to rally the nation to unity in the name of God. Instead we had tough prelate-politicians like Beaufort and Morton and Wolsey and the men who helped to burn St. Joan and to pillory well-meaning reformers like Bishop Pecoche. Only in the following century did the movement of Catholic reform reappear with Colet and Fisher and More. But it was then too late to avert the crisis. The English way diverged from the Catholic way and ran astray into the waste lands of sectarianism. The spiritual successors of Langland are to be found not in the Catholic Church, nor even in the Church of England, but among the Puritans and the rebels, with Fox and Bunyan and Whitfield and Blake. But this popular tradition of English religion which was divorced from Catholic unity and even from the national unity after the sixteenth century already exists in its purest and most unadulterated form in the work of Langland. He shows us what English religion might have been if it had not been broken by schism and narrowed by sectarianism and heresy."

If we move forward down the years and take in a wider landscape we shall find that these innovating bodies, like the new orders that arose within the Church, lost their early dynamism. The next outbreak of the prophetic spirit took place outside organised Christianity. It manifested itself in men like Carlyle and Ruskin, Mazzini and, still later, Tolstoy. These are our modern "prophets" and, since they were not churchmen, they did nothing to restore the lost balance and recover the wholeness of a full Catholicism. That can be done only by those who are in alliance with the institutional and sacerdotal aspects of our religion.

The necessity of that alliance between the ruling authority, the priesthood and the prophet is implied in the very term "Catholic." The Church so described is not fully represented by the Princes of the Church and those in orders. The wholeness which the term "Catholic" implies is not complete until there is present in the body and clearly articulate the element which we have named prophetic. That is clear from what has been said as to Israel and the Primitive Church. Those elements which are still active themselves suffer if they are deprived of other partners to the alliance.

This will be better understood if we take the concrete case emphasised in the foregoing. The function of the Catholic Prophet is to rein-

force his allies, Pope and Priest. His proper role is not that of a rebel against institutionalism but its friend. This is exemplified by the Apostle to whom reference has been made. Not only was St. Paul both churchman and prophet, but it was his churchmanship which gave him his text as preacher. His Gospel is to be found in his interpretation of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ. It was this dynamic conception which distinguished him from both the rebel prophet and the ecclesiastical official who is no more than an official. For him, the Church as thus interpreted is the Gospel, it is the incarnation of Christ present now on earth to redeem and sanctify. And it is just the re-discovery of the doctrine of the Mystical Body by the present generation which gives us hope for the future. In it can be seen the prospect of a balanced Catholicism in which all the various functions that have been named are harmonised in a co-operative unity. It is by the whole-hearted acceptance of the Pauline conception that the Church will be equipped for triumphing in the crisis that lies before her. The activation of the prophetic element will vitalise its allies.

In order to show how this will come about, it is necessary to point out that the role of the prophet is essentially social. He addresses himself to the individual as a member of the Body, as a citizen in the Kingdom of God. Let us see how, in so doing, he comes to the help of his fellow-workers in other fields!

It is obvious how necessary are his services for giving effect to the numerous encyclicals dealing with social questions issued by recent Popes. Necessarily these are stated in formal language. They are neither intended nor fitted to popularise the teaching they embody. If Authority is to speak to the man in the street it needs the assistance of the dynamic preacher and writer, the spirituality that gives life to what otherwise would be but formulas. A great work waits to be done in this direction. The encyclicals in question contain material which the fire of the prophet could ignite and which, thus ignited, might set the world ablaze to the glory of God and the renovation of our civilisation. In this particular field the closing of the gap described by Christopher Dawson as having separated the institutionalists and the reformers would have consequences which would be nothing less than startling. Never has there been so great an opportunity for the social prophet basing himself on the Christian Revelation and submitting himself to Catholic Authority.

A further example of the effect that might be wrought by a closer alliance between different functions is afforded in connection with the

Liturgical Movement. This also is an expression of a Christianity that is social rather than individualistic. The work of God in the worshipping community is a corporate act. But that the Liturgy should be effective the worshippers must be able to translate its general terms into language relevant to the contemporary situation. They must learn to pray with and for a Church that finds itself struggling under the specific difficulties experienced by the present generation and as citizens of a world faced with one of the grayest crises in its long history. Prayer becomes real when it is related to the actualities of the hour and liturgical worship is vitalised when it is informed as to the contemporary human situation. The message of the prophet speaking to his generation imparts to the Sacrifice offered by the priest that something-more-than-ritual significance which it needs.

Perhaps we have laid too much stress on the revival of the Church's prophetic functions. But this is because, at the present time, it is this which seems most to call for attention. Better than any other of the ministries mentioned it serves to illustrate what is meant by the need of an all-round, comprehensive Catholicism. It must not, however, make us forget the general theme, which can be put briefly. In the Hebrew Patriarch we saw a combination of offices which is analagous to the fulness of Christ as High Priest, King and Prophet of the Kingdom. This fulness He imparted to the Apostles. The apostolic office, it is contended, transcends all others and contains them. In the apostles we see a unity that passed on to the Church over which they presided the character of interdependence in the various functions which it exercised. And it is this wholeness, this harmonious co-ordination and co-operation between the different parts which is the outward sign of the Church's holiness. Wholeness and holiness are closely related. The Church's apostolicity is seen in its sanctity and its sanctity is expressed in its apostolicity.

The maintenance of this wholeness and of right proportions between the different elements named is the work of the Holy Spirit perpetuating the reign of Christ in His Church and imparting to her the fulness foreshadowed in the patriarchs. It is in proportion to the activity in the Mystical Body of the Holy Spirit creating an ordered life truly representative of the Whole Christ, Priest, King and Prophet, that the Church will be prepared for the critical times that lie ahead.

STANLEY B. JAMES.

Moral Theology

THE RECKONING OF TIME.

Following on Father O'Connell's article on how to find the latest time for midnight, which appeared in the January number of the *Record*, an interesting Reply of the Pontifical Commission for the Interpretation of the Code, given on 29th May, 1947, and published in the *A.A.S.* of 6th September of the same year, will be found in the Official Documents section of this issue. Father O'Connell drew our attention to the various methods of computing time; the Reply under consideration solves the doubt; whether a person, having chosen one method, is bound to adhere to it, or whether he may follow different "times" for different acts. The answer is that for acts which are formally different, different times may be adopted; and by implication we conclude that for acts which are not formally distinct, the same method of computing time must be adhered to.

How are acts to be distinguished formally? Acts are formally distinct when they have different objects; or if they have the same object, are imposed by different precepts. Thus, to say Mass and to recite the divine Office are two acts formally distinct. Both are materially constituted by the recitation of words, but the Mass and the Office are two distinct matters. Likewise, in the one material act, we can sometimes distinguish two formal acts. To say Mass fasting and not earlier than an hour before dawn is one material act, but by so doing the celebrant obeys two distinct precepts, and so may be said to perform two acts, one imposed by the law of the Eucharistic fast and the other by the law which forbids the commencement of Mass till the hour which precedes the dawn. Should he say Mass after having broken his fast, he commits a sin; should he say it not fasting and also before the hour fixed he commits a second sin: two sins by the one material act of celebration of Mass.

When may we adopt one of these different methods of computing time? Can. 33, par. 1, states that in reckoning time we are to follow the common usage of the place—this is a general statement. Immediately, four exceptions are stated when it is permissible to use either local time (true time or mean time) or legal time (regional v.g. Eastern Standard time, or extraordinary e.g. daylight saving time). The four exceptions when one may depart from the ordinary accepted time of the place are: the private celebration of Mass, the private recitation of the divine office, the reception of Holy Communion and fast and abstinence. All these, if compared one with another, are formally different acts, for they have

different objects. A person is free to select any recognised time for one of them, and change his choice for another. An example: The clock strikes midnight between Friday and Saturday at Wilcannia. Titius decides that as Friday has passed, he may take some meat for his supper and he concludes his meal at 12.25 a.m.; next morning he attends Mass, and lawfully goes to Communion, for mean midnight at Wilcannia is 12.28 a.m. According to Father O'Connell's table, he could receive Communion on several days (July 13th-August 8th), provided he concluded his meal before 12.34 legal time, which at that period is true solar midnight. Likewise, a priest could commence the recitation of Friday's small Hours at midnight of Thursday, legal time, then take some nourishment of meat before true midnight, and not be bound to repeat the portion of the office of Friday, which was said before his refectio of meat. Friday's office was said on Friday (legal time), and the meat was eaten on Thursday (solar time): there are two distinct precepts involved and he lawfully chooses legal time for the recitation of the office, and solar time for the abstinence. It is important, of course, that one know the margin between the different times in his particular locality. In places East of the conventional meridian, for the most part, legal time is latest than can be followed; but for places West of the meridian solar time gives an advantage.

As was remarked above, an act which is materially one, v.g. the celebration of Mass, may be more than one act, if it be considered formally, because it is governed by different precepts, each of which imposes a distinct obligation. Let us suppose a priest has an indult to commence Mass, in case of necessity, an hour after midnight, and that such a case of necessity is verified during a period when summer time is in vogue. Could this Priest take something to eat at, say 12.55 a.m. legal time and then commence Mass at one o'clock, just five minutes later? Apart from the question of fitness, and having regard only for the law, he could do so. There are two distinct precepts involved, one determining the time at which he may commence Mass, and the other obliging him to be fasting from midnight before celebrating. He follows solar time for the Eucharistic fast and legal time for the hour of celebration of Mass.

Many interesting, though not altogether practical questions can be raised when dealing with the various methods of computing time, and one must be careful to keep the subject within proper limits. We must remember that a day in Law is a period of twenty-four hours commencing at midnight. A priest may commence Mass at 1 a.m. (if he has the necessary indult and the conditions are verified) and it is possible

that he could have this Mass finished before midnight according to solar time. In Wilcannia, for instance, during the war years, when daylight saving time was in force, he could have commenced Mass at 1 a.m. legal time and be finished before mean solar midnight (1.28 a.m.). Would it have been lawful for him, to say another Mass the following morning, since he has not said Mass on the day which began at true midnight? If would not, for the day, as far as it concerns the celebration of Mass, commenced at midnight legal time, and it is forbidden to celebrate Mass more than once on the same day. Could a priest on Christmas day, who had finished his midnight Mass, before solar midnight, take some refreshment and then say the other Masses in the morning? It would not be lawful for him to do so. He must be fasting from midnight to celebrate Mass, and when he commences Mass at 12 legal time, the day as far as the Eucharistic fast is considered is to be reckoned according to legal time. By eating or drinking after the moment of midnight legal time he breaks the fast, and so cannot lawfully celebrate another Mass on that day. The second question answered by the Pontifical Commission was that the three Masses on Christmas night are not acts formally distinct, so that what is chosen as midnight for the first Mass must also count as midnight for all the Masses to be celebrated by the same priest within the next twenty-four hours.

*

*

*

*

THE SEAL OF CONFESSION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A bridal couple are advised by the parish priest to receive the sacraments of Penance and Eucharist before they contract marriage. On the morning of the wedding, the pastor notices that they are not at the Communion rails, and he wonders if they have omitted also to go to Confession. To make sure, he asks the assistant if they have been to confession to him. The assistant knows why they were not at Communion, for he remembers that two people to whom he had to deny absolution were about to be married, because they told him so in the course of the confession. Does he violate the seal if he replies that he did hear their confessions without, of course, giving any indication as to how he knew it was the couple in question?

CONFESSARIUS.

REPLY.

The assistant priest has used knowledge which he gained from the confessional. He does not seem to have violated the seal; nor has he used his sacramental knowledge to the detriment of his penitents.

In order to make clear the reasons for this answer, let us invite our readers to a brief survey of the question of the seal of confession. Most of what we have to say may be found in the manuals of Moral Theology, but a presentation of the matter will, we hope, be pardoned on account of its great practical value.

When a priest hears confessions, he is told the sins of the penitents, and incidentally he may also become possessed of other personal and private information concerning their real life, the state of their conscience and even of their temporal affairs. He comes to know things of which he was previously ignorant, and much of the knowledge which he gains is not to the advantage, but rather to the discredit of the persons concerned. From the natural law, there arises a strict obligation on the confessor not to divulge, or in any way refer to the information he has received, not only to other persons, but also, outside the tribunal of confession, to the penitent himself. There is an implied contract to such secrecy, from the fact that the sinner manifests his sins to the priest—for it is clear that he would not tell them to the confessor if he did not understand that they could not be revealed under any circumstances. Further, when our Lord instituted the Sacrament of Penance, He implicitly at least imposed the obligations without which this means of reconciliation would be useless. The Sacrament would not be availed of by the faithful if they could not be certain that their secrets would be respected; and so we may say that the seal of confession, which is based on the natural law and is the object of an implied contract, is also derived from the divine positive law. It is further promulgated in the Church's legislation in Can. 889 and 890 of the Code. The main reasons for the obligation of the seal are to protect the penitent and to ensure that the reception of the Sacrament of Penance will not be made odious to the faithful. The virtues concerned are charity, justice and religion.

The obligation of secrecy as it affects the confessor is twofold: 1) not to reveal what he has learned from the confession, and 2) not to use the knowledge gained from the confessional to the detriment of the penitent, even though there be no danger of revelation. The first of these obligations is that of the seal, strictly so called, and it forbids the betrayal of the sinner. The second is also called by some authors the *sigillum*, but the use of knowledge is not necessarily a betrayal of a secret, as the knowledge from the confessional is not communicated to any person—and the violation of a secret implies the communication of knowledge. The use of sacramental knowledge to the disadvantage of the penitent is forbidden for his protection, lest he suffer any detriment

from the frequentation of one of the means of salvation.

The matter of the seal. In the course of hearing confessions, a priest is told many things: some of them he learns now for the first time, some of them he knew before—they may be public knowledge. Penitents are bound to tell what is necessary to explain the species of their sin, but they may and sometimes do go further and acquaint the priest with details which have no bearing whatever on the confession—and no persuasion will convince them they are exceeding what they are obliged to do. The question then must be asked: what facts known from the confessional must the confessor keep inviolably secret, what revelation would constitute a betrayal of the sinner? To reveal what we call sacramental knowledge is to break the seal, and so we must enquire: What is sacramental knowledge? It may be considered under three headings: 1. The sins confessed; 2. facts or circumstances told to the confessor by the penitent in order to explain the state of his conscience, and 3. anything else known to the confessor consequent on the confession, which the penitent would reasonably object to have made known to others.

1. There is no need to stress the point that the sins confessed are directly subject to the seal. If they are secret sins, the confessor knows of them from only one source; if they are public, he knows them also from the confessional, and to reveal them as having been confessed is to break the secrecy of the confessional. A parishioner habitually misses Mass and is public known as failing in this duty. Touched by divine grace, he goes to confession to the parish priest, who, full of joy at the return of the sinner, tells his curate: Caius was at confession to-night and made a full and sincere accusation of his neglect of Mass. The parish priest in such a case breaks the seal, for he has told his curate what Caius manifested in the confessional; he has divulged sacramental knowledge. He knew the sins of Caius otherwise, but he also knew them from the tribunal of Penance, and it is precisely as he has the knowledge from the confessional that he tells it to his assistant. If the pastor had been content to remark that Caius had been to confession, he would have done no harm, for the fact of going to confession is not covered by any agreement or obligation to secrecy, at least in usual cases. It is true that the curate on knowing that Caius had confessed, would have deduced that among the sins told to the priest was that of missing Mass, but his conclusion would not be based on a knowledge of what happened in the confessional.

2. We are bound to confess our sins, but in order to do so, it is

sometimes necessary to explain circumstances of person or place or time, etc., from which the confessor learns something about the penitent or others of which he was not previously aware. Such knowledge would not be communicated, except for the purpose of confession, and is covered by the seal. It is made known to the confessor with a view to obtaining absolution, and the penitent has a right that it be kept secret. For the same reason, the confessor would violate the rights of the penitent if he were to divulge the penance he imposed, unless of course it were a very small one from which no one could argue that he had been guilty of anything but minor transgressions from which no man is exempt. But public facts, which the confessor learns for the first time in hearing a confession are not usually covered by the seal; it is only accidental that the priest did not know them already. They could be matter under the seal, if by mentioning that they were known from confession, a certain or probable conclusion could be drawn as to some sin that was confessed. If, for example, Caius were to confess to the new assistant that he was wanting in duty towards his children, and the priest at various times afterwards spoke about him as a married man, there is no violation of the seal. The fact that a man is married is a public one and can be learned in many ways other than from the confessional. But if he were so to speak or act that it would be known that he learned of Caius' marriage from the confessional, he could easily be guilty of an indirect violation of the seal; for it would be a probable conclusion that Caius had confessed some sin which had relation to his conjugal state. Briefly, then, outside the risk of betraying the penitent, the mention of public facts which are actually learned from the confessional, does not constitute a breaking of the seal; but the revelation of secret information is forbidden, as it betrays the sinner and destroys the confidence he has in the secrecy of the sacred tribunal: it is a revelation of sacramental knowledge.

3. Finally, the term sacramental knowledge includes any other information gained from the confessional, which the penitent could reasonably expect would be kept secret. Thus natural defects, social condition, financial status and such like, may at times be subject to the laws of the sacramental secret.

Breaking the Seal. As was stated above, the obligation of the confessor regarding sacramental knowledge is two-fold: not to reveal such knowledge, and not to use it to the disadvantage of the penitent. Let us attend to each of them separately.

1. A Confessor would violate the seal if he betrayed the sinner;

that is if he revealed sacramental knowledge, and at the same time indicated the sinner. If by his words or actions both the sinner and any item which is covered by the seal can be known with certainty—even though as a fact they are not known—the seal is broken directly. If either the identity of the sinner or the matter of the seal can be known with real probability, then the seal is broken indirectly. Direct breaking of the seal is a betrayal of the penitent; indirect breaking involves the danger of a betrayal. Thus it would be a direct violation of the seal for a confessor to say: Caius confessed that he missed Mass; or Caius, who is publicly known seldom to go to Mass, is unable to rise early on Sunday morning because he spends Saturday night at a gambling saloon (a fact which was known only to his companions in vice, and is told to the confessor in explanation of the sin of missing Mass), or again: Caius (who is generally regarded as a model of prudence) is a very scrupulous man (and this the confessor knows from the way in which Caius makes his accusation). In these examples, the sin of missing Mass, the frequenting of a gambling saloon and the affliction of scrupulosity are all covered by the obligation of secrecy; and their revelation together with the indication of who the penitent is constitutes a direct betrayal of confidence and a violation of the seal. If, however, the penitent were not identified with certainty, but only with probability, then because of the danger that he can be found out, the seal is said to be broken indirectly. The confessor is indirectly responsible for the result of his words or actions which he knows contain the possibility of revelation: and for that reason he is already guilty of a betrayal of a trust which is in every sense inviolable and must be exposed to no danger or risk of violation. Thus, if a confessor, after hearing confessions on a Saturday night were to say: Among my penitents to-night was one who had missed Mass for a long time, he throws a suspicion on every one of them, and each of them is the probable sinner. Such a statement could be in some circumstances a direct breaking of the seal, as would happen if nearly all the penitents were known to be faithful in the attendance at Sunday Mass.

2. So much for the breaking of the seal. We repeat it implies a violation of a secret or at least the danger of such violation. We must now consider the other obligation which binds the confessor with regard to knowledge he has from the confessional: not to use this knowledge, even without the danger of revelation, to the disadvantage of the penitent. We are not bound to abstain from all use of knowledge gained from the confessional. We may pray for our penitents that God may help them

in the trials we know they have to undergo, we may profit for our own spiritual welfare by the example of virtue they have shown us; but to change our friendly attitude towards one of them because we knew from his confession that he was not true to his friends would be a wrong use of sacramental knowledge—to the detriment of the penitent. The old case of the immoral or dishonest servant, whose misdeeds were known from the confessional, comes under this head. To dismiss such a servant is to use sacramental knowledge to his detriment, and so a violation of the laws which forbid whatever would make the use of confession more difficult for the faithful.

In addition to these two obligations of a confessor: not to violate the seal directly or indirectly, and not to use the knowledge had from confession to the disadvantage of the penitent, there is a further duty, expressed in an Instruction of the Holy Office (9 June, 1915), which forbids any reference to things treated in confession, whether in public or private, in sermons, theological conferences, etc., even though there be no danger that the penitent in question will be betrayed or sacramental knowledge used to his disadvantage. The reason of this is that the faithful rightly expect that what they have told in confession will ever be kept within the absolute secrecy of the sacred tribunal, and they would find it most difficult to go to confession if there were the slightest suspicion that reference would be made in any circumstances to what they made known to their confessor. The only exception to this rule is for the purpose of necessary guidance, and then one must act with the greatest prudence lest the person consulted would be likely to arrive at a conclusion as to who the penitent was. It is a safe practice, if the confessor needs the help of a more prudent experienced or learned priest to solve a case submitted to him, to ask and receive the consent of the penitent, and thus all danger of infringing on the sacred obligations of the seal of confession will be obviated.

Directly to break the seal of confession is always a mortal sin, even though the matter revealed is of apparently small import, for the damage done to the sacrament is always serious. To break the seal indirectly is also a grave sin, but may at times be venial, according to the greater or less danger of revelation. To use sacramental knowledge to the detriment of the penitent is a sin, the gravity of which is to be determined by the harm done to the sacrament and the disadvantage suffered by the penitent. To treat of things known from the confessional, apart from the danger of revelation, is also serious in itself (*ex genere suo*), but may be slight if there be small risk of scandal or danger of making the reception of the sacrament of Penance more difficult.

In conclusion, let us return to the case which was submitted by CONFESSARIUS. All the assistant priest revealed to his pastor was the fact that the bridal couple had been to confession to him: he did not say he had refused them absolution. Actually, he knows they were his penitents from sacramental knowledge, but this knowledge he in no way divulges; and it is possible that he could know otherwise. The sacramental knowledge that he did use was not to the disadvantage of the penitents; it more likely delivered them from rather inconvenient investigations of the parish priest. That their state of soul may have been better had the pastor made such investigations is beside the point, but what is much to the point is that the use made by the assistant of the knowledge had from the confession caused no molestation or inconvenience to his penitents, and so was not a violation of the obligations of a confessor in regard to the confidences entrusted to him by the sinner.

JAMES MADDEN.

Canon Law

I. CENSURE INCURRED BY CO-OPERATION IN ABORTION.

Dear Rev. Sir,—

I am seeking a solution of the following case. Arthur explains to me that he advised Bertha to procure an abortion. His advice, apparently, was effective in making Bertha determine upon this course. Arthur secured a suitable drug to bring about the desired effect. Meanwhile, however, he repented sincerely and set out to repair the damage. He refused to hand over the drug to Bertha, and pleaded with her to abandon her evil intention. Alas, she had been convinced only too effectively by Arthur's original representations and proceeded to bring about an abortion regardless of his pleas.

Does he incur excommunication by reason of his original attitude and actions?

SENESENS.

REPLY.

The penalty enacted in Canon Law for the crime of abortion is enuntiated in Canon 2350: "Those who procure abortion, not excepting the mother, if the effect takes place, incur excommunication reserved to the Ordinary".

The law of the Code regarding co-operators in crime is set out clearly. Not only one who commands a crime and who is thus the principal culprit, but also those who induce the commission of a crime or concur in it in any way, incur no less guilt, other things being equal, than the one who perpetrates it, if without their help the crime would not have been committed (Canon 2209, 3). Any kind of co-operation, therefore, whether primary or secondary, involves the same guilt in the co-operator as that of the actual perpetrator of the crime, provided that the crime would not have been committed without the help of the co-operator.

Similarly, in regard to the penalties incurred by co-operators in crime, Canon 2231 lays down that if more than one co-operate to commit a crime, although only one is named in the law, those also who are mentioned in Canon 2209, 1-3, are bound by the same penalty, unless the law provides otherwise.

It may be observed that pre-code authorities more commonly exempted from penalties those who were secondary accomplices, e.g., those who co-operated by advice, by providing a means, etc. According

to this more common view the penalty was incurred only by those who were primary accomplices in the actual accomplishment of the crime.

It is clear that Arthur's co-operation, both by way of tendering advice and, also, in procuring a suitable drug for the purpose specified would cause him to incur the penalty enacted by law for those guilty of abortion. It remains to be decided whether his withdrawal of co-operation would result in his avoiding the penalty.

"One who by timely retraction completely withdrew his influence toward the commission of a crime is freed from all imputability, even though the perpetrator nevertheless completed the crime for reasons of his own (*rationes sibi proprias*)", Can. 2209, 5. It is beyond doubt that the co-operation involved in securing the drug has been withdrawn completely and opportunely. On this score no penalty is incurred through the subsequent commission of the crime by some other means obtained by Bertha. What is to be said of the co-operation involved in his tendering the original advice? Despite his present pleadings it has been effective in forming Bertha's resolution to procure an abortion. Nevertheless the conclusion to be drawn is that, on this score, too, Arthur avoids the penalty. His present avowals are as complete a retraction as it is possible to make. He withdraws his co-operation completely and opportunely and Bertha's resolve persists "*ob causas sibi proprias*" (Can. 2209, 5).

This conclusion is borne out by the nature of a censure. It implies an attitude of contumacy on the part of the subject, an attitude of contempt for the ecclesiastical authority which enacted the penalty. Such an attitude is not compatible with true repentance and a sincere effort to undo the harm already done.

*

*

*

*

II. FACULTIES TO HEAR CONFESSIONS AT SEA.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Father Titius, a member of a religious order, had obtained the faculties of the diocese in which his religious house was located. The faculties were granted until such time as his Superiors should transfer him to a house situated in another diocese. It was clearly understood that his faculties were to expire on leaving the diocese. He was transferred to a post overseas, to which he travelled by ship. The question has been raised as to whether he was empowered to hear Confessions at sea in virtue of Canon 883?

PERPLEXED.

REPLY.

Canon 883, 1.—*Sacerdotes omnes maritimum iter arripientes, dummodo vel a proprio Ordinario, vel ab Ordinario portus in quo navim conscendunt, vel etiam ab Ordinario cujusvis portus interjecti per quem in itinere transeunt, facultatem rite acceperint confessiones audiendi, possunt, toto itinere, quorumlibet fidelium secum navigantium confessiones in navi excipere, quamvis navis in itinere transeat vel etiam aliquandiu consistat variis in locis diversorum Ordinariorum jurisdictioni subjectis.*

In order that a priest may enjoy the faculties granted in this canon he must be in possession of faculties to hear Confessions granted by his own Proper Ordinary, or by the Ordinary of the port of embarkation, or by the Ordinary of some intermediate port. These Ordinaries do not confer the faculties to hear Confessions at sea, for their jurisdiction to absolve does not extend to non-subjects in territories outside their own dioceses. No Ordinary could delegate a priest to hear the Confessions of all on board a ship, only those of his own subjects. It is from the Pope, then, that the faculties of Canon 883 are obtained. But actual possession of faculties to absolve conferred by one of the Ordinaries named in Canon 883 is a necessary condition for acquiring faculties to absolve at sea. Therefore, supposing that Father Titius had not obtained faculties from another of the Ordinaries listed, he did not acquire faculties to absolve in terms of Canon 883, seeing that the faculties granted by his Proper Ordinary had expired.

To make this reply complete a particular contingency must be considered. We have assumed that the Ordinary of the place in which the religious house of Father Titius is located is the "*Ordinarius proprius*" of Canon 883. If, however, the priest is a member of an exempt religious institute and enjoys faculties to hear the Confessions of members, granted by his own major superior, it may be argued that this latter is the "*Ordinarius proprius*". In that hypothesis Father Titius would have acquired the faculties of Canon 883. Applying the rules of interpretation there is much against this opinion. The context suggests that the mind of the legislator is to enumerate only Local Ordinaries. Further, a reference to the pre-Code law and its authoritative commentators confirms this interpretation. On the other hand it would be unreasonable to reject the theory proposed. In Canon 198, 1, are listed those who bear the name "Ordinary" in law. Amongst these are "*pro suis vero subditis Superiores maiores in religionibus clericalibus exemptis*". Cappello observes: '*Quae sententia improbabilis non videtur*'.

Viewing the matter in retrospect it would seem to be a fair conclusion that in the presence of a positive and probable doubt—in virtue of Father Titius, possessing faculties to absolve from his own Major Superior—the Church supplied jurisdiction. (Canon 209).

* * * *

III. BEQUEST TO A PROFESSED SISTER.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A professed Sister has become the beneficiary under her mother's will of the latter's insurance policy of £1000. The terms of the policy provide for payments to the beneficiary at the rate of so much per month. May the Sister make over these payments to the Institute.

ANXIUS.

REPLY.

A professed religious of simple vows retains the ownership of his property, also the capacity to acquire new property, unless the constitutions state the contrary. (Canon 580, 1). However, it is not consonant with the spirit of the vow of poverty for a religious to be involved in the administration of property or to handle the revenues derived from its investment. It is provided, therefore, that every novice, before taking simple vows, whether temporary or perpetual, must cede the administration of his property to somebody of his own choice for the whole period during which he will be bound by simple vows (Canon 569, 1). Similarly, unless the constitutions rule otherwise, he must dispose freely of the use and usufruct of his property during the same period.

Provision is made, too, for such a contingency as is described by our correspondent. Should the religious acquire new property subsequent to profession, a similar act of cession must be made (Canon 569, 2). Accordingly, the Sister in question must appoint an administrator of the bequest and dispose freely of its use and usufruct. She is at liberty to choose the Institute for this purpose, or she may choose any other physical or moral person.

Before replying to the query, one more law concerning the property of religious must be recalled. In religious congregations professed members are forbidden to abdicate gratuitously the dominion of their goods "per actum inter vivos". It will be observed that in this canon, as in the foregoing laws, the aim of the legislator is to preserve intact the capital possessed by a religious. Should he leave the institute the acts of cession of administration and of disposal of use and usufruct cease to have effect and he recovers full control of his property.

In view of the foregoing exposition it must be said that the Sister

may not make over the insurance payments to the Institute. Though paid in instalments, they do not represent the revenue of an investment, but rather a capital sum. She may make over to the Institute the administration of the money and dispose of revenues derived from its investment. Simply to donate the payments to the Institute would be a violation of Canon 583.

* * * *

IV. DISPENSATION FROM MULTIPLE IMPEDIMENT OF CONSANGUINITY.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A dispensation was obtained from the Bishop for the marriage of two first cousins. Some time after the marriage, I learnt that the parties were double first cousins—the father of Caius and the mother of Bertha were brother and sister, similarly the father of Bertha and the mother of Caius. No mention was made of the double relationship in seeking dispensation as I had no notion of its existence.

Was the dispensation valid? If the reply is in the negative, what must I do to rectify the marriage? J.

REPLY.

The dispensation was valid in virtue of the provision of Canon 1052 of the Code.

In this case there is a twofold impediment of consanguinity, because, in the law of the Code, blood-relationship is multiplied when the common ancestor is multiplied. However, provision is made for the very contingency described in the query by Canon 1052. "A dispensation from an impediment of consanguinity or affinity, granted for a certain degree of the impediment, is valid, even though there is in the petition or in the grant an error regarding the degree, provided the degree which really exists is inferior, or even though another impediment of the same kind, in an equal or inferior degree, has been concealed in the petition". The last clause covers the case of J; another impediment of the same kind (consanguinity) in equal degree (second degree of the collateral line) was concealed in the petition.

This is true whether the deception was culpable or inculpable, seeing that the law makes no distinction. It need not be emphasised that wilful deception in setting out the facts of the case is sinful. "If anyone, in the petition to obtain a rescript from the Holy See or from the Local Ordinary, through fraud or deceit withholds the truth or states a falsehood, he can be punished by his own Ordinary according to the gravity of the case". (Canon 2361).

JAMES CARROLL.

Liturgy

CEREMONIES AT PRIVATE BAPTISM.

Dear Rev. Sir,

The Roman Ritual says, that in private Baptism of infants, the ceremonies following the Baptism are to be administered immediately, and the other ceremonies afterwards supplied in the Church.

My difficulties are concerning the ceremonies that follow the Baptism:—

1. Must they always be given at a private Baptism? Is the obligation binding *sub gravi*?

2. In the case of private Baptism in a public hospital, the priest feels that he ought to baptise the child as quickly as possible and allow the nurse to continue to work on the child. Is that sufficient reason to omit these ceremonies until all are supplied in the church?

3. If it is a fairly common practice in a certain diocese to omit these ceremonies until later, would that custom constitute a sufficient reason?

4. When a priest supplies the ceremonies after a private Baptism which was administered by another priest, he usually supplies all the ceremonies. That implies that he does not expect that the ceremonies following the Baptism were given at private Baptism.

5. Would it be advisable to have a general ruling to be content with the actual Baptism and leave all the ceremonies till the child is brought to the church?

C.E.V.

REPLY.

1. The Roman Ritual (Titulus II—Caput I, n. 28) states: "In danger of death it is lawful to confer Baptism privately; and...if it be administered by a Priest or Deacon, if time permits, the ceremonies which follow the Baptism are also observed". This Rubric of the Ritual is identical with Can. 759 of the Code. There is no doubt then that these ceremonies: the anointing with chrism, the giving of the white garment and of the lighted candle, should be performed as a rule—the exception being if time does not allow. They are enjoined by one of the Church's laws and so are of obligation. But if we ask the extent of the obligation, we find a difference of opinion. Davis (*Moral and Pastoral Theology*, 1946, vol. III, p. 59) writes: "...if the Baptism is administered by a priest or deacon, he should add after the Baptism if time

permits those ceremonies which ordinarily follow the Baptism. The obligation to do so is a grave one". Cappello, on the other hand (*De Sacramentis*, 1945, vol. 1, n. 170) has: *Ubi tempus suppetat, datur vera obligatio, non tamen gravis, servandi caeremonias praedictas.*

These ceremonies properly belong to the rite of solemn Baptism; certainly they form a notable part of that function and, if they were omitted without grave cause, it would be a serious matter. They do not, however, seem to be strictly a portion of the rite of private Baptism: indeed, unless the minister is at least in Deacon's Orders, there is no question of their being used at all. It is generally agreed that if they are used, the Baptism still remains a private function; and we are inclined to the view that to omit them, even without cause, would not be a serious sin, provided there was no contempt or scandal associated with the omission.

2. If we accept the doctrine in the previous answer, any reasonable cause will excuse from performing these ceremonies at the time of private Baptism; and it does seem most reasonable that if the child's life is in danger and the nurse is using all her skill to save him, she should be given very opportunity to continue. The Rubric allows want of time as a cause for not performing the ceremonies. Surely this expression is not to be confined to the case where time has ceased for the child and he is dead; it may, we think, also include the case where the precious moments available would be required to save the child's life. Another rather common cause easily excusing from the anointing with chrism, etc., would be the difficulty of having access to the child's head, because he is lying in a cot and cannot be lifted or moved without risk.

3. This law, like most human laws, can be abrogated by custom. But we rather think our correspondent has in mind not the abrogation of the law but its interpretation. When he asks if a fairly common practice in a certain diocese would be sufficient reason to omit the ceremonies, he may mean that experience shows that the priests usually find sufficient reason in their pastoral work to leave these ceremonies till later, and that for practical purposes they are not given at the time of Baptism, because the common judgment of the priests of the diocese considers there is always an excusing cause. Could one then safely follow the practice of other prudent priests? To follow what is done by prudent men is free from blame. If those, more learned in the Law and more experienced, consider certain sets of circumstances, even frequently occurring, would justify the omission of the ceremonies, we may with a clear conscience accept their interpretation of the Law. But if our cor-

respondent really means to ask is the practice itself a sufficient reason, we reply that it is not, unless it amounts to a legitimate custom observed by the greater part of the clergy for the space of forty years.

4. When a Priest supplies the ceremonies after a private Baptism which was administered by another Priest, in some cases he will not know for certain whether the ceremonies in question have been given. If enquiries from the parents are useless, or are not made because it is foreseen that they will be without success, he will have to solve the doubt on the principle of presumptions. If he has found from experience that in most instances the mere essentials, the matter and form of the Sacrament, were all that were administered to the dying child, it is more than likely that nothing else was done in this case either. This does not, however, mean that he takes it for granted that the ceremonies are never performed. The existence of a universal custom against the performing of the ceremonies at the time of private Baptism could hardly be established definitely from the fact that they are usually given at the Church when the other ceremonies are supplied. The giving of these ceremonies at the Church argues a doubt as to the *fact* whether they have been given before; but it does not prove that the *law* enjoining them has been abrogated by custom.

5. Since the reasons which would excuse from the conferring of these ceremonies are not universally present, we doubt the validity of such a ruling, unless from the supreme ecclesiastical Authority, except it were a declaration that the Law was already abrogated by legitimate custom.

*

*

*

*

REQUIEM MASS ON A SUNDAY WHEN *MISSA PRO POPULO* IS NOT PRESCRIBED.

Dear Rev. Sir,

If a Priest has not the faculty to binate on a Sunday, may he celebrate an Exequial Mass on such a day, if he is not bound to say the Mass *pro populo*?

PERPLEXUS.

REPLY.

An Exequial Mass or Funeral Mass is that celebrated in connection with the rites of ecclesiastical Burial, which are referred to in Can. 1215 and set out in Titulus VI. of the Roman Ritual. This Mass enjoys great privileges: it is forbidden only on Primary Feasts of the first class celebrated throughout the Church and on the Feast of the Titular or of

the Dedication of the Church where the funeral takes place, or on the Feast of the principal Patron of the place. Sundays then are not excluded, unless they be numbered among the Feasts just referred to. Requiem Masses, however, are forbidden as often as there is an obligation to celebrate a conventual or parochial Mass which cannot be fulfilled by another priest. (Addit. et Variat. III, n. 12). Conventual Masses affect only those who are bound to the Office in Choir, but parochial Masses must be said by those entrusted with a Parish. The difficulty is to be sure what is meant by a parochial Mass, as the term is used in different senses, which must be determined from the context. We think we are near the truth when we say that a parochial Mass is one that is said on a Sunday or Feast of precept so that the Faithful may satisfy their obligation of hearing Mass. This seems to be the meaning in the Rubrics. If a conventual Mass is to satisfy the obligations of choir, a parochial Mass in the same sentence would seem to be a Mass to satisfy the Sunday precept. In this sense, every Sunday Mass which is celebrated for the convenience of the parishioners would be a parochial Mass and could be called a Mass *pro populo*—not that it is necessarily applied for them, but is said that they may attend it. If we restrict the meaning of the parochial Mass to that which is said by the Pastor *ex justitia* for his people—as might appear from a decree of the S.C.R. (3623, I., 28th Nov., 1884)—then we have the strange position that the parochial Mass is not always said in the parochial Church at all, for if circumstances demand or advise, it may be offered elsewhere (Can. 466, par. 4). Further, though perhaps not fitting, there would be no violation of law if the Mass said at a funeral were applied not for the deceased but for the people of the parish. Sometimes the principal Mass on a Sunday, celebrated *in cantu* or with some solemnity is called the parochial Mass. This Mass could not be supplanted by a Requiem nor, we think, could the others which form part of the regular public services of the Church. After all, a Funeral Mass is for the immediate benefit of the deceased as part of the last offices, while the usual Sunday Masses are for the whole parish. We may remark, by the way, that those who attend the Funeral Mass fulfil their Sunday obligation.

A Priest, then, who is not bound to celebrate a Mass for the benefit of the people, could offer a Funeral Requiem Mass, which did not interfere with the usual Sunday services. Since he is saying only one Mass, there seems to be no question of his binating: if he had the faculty to binate, he could not use it to say a Funeral Requiem for he may say

two Masses on Sunday only for the needs of the people—*nisi... notabilis fidelium pars Missae adstare non possit* (Can. 806, par. 2.).

* * * *

RECITAL OF THE *DOMINE NON SUM DIGNUS* BEFORE COMMUNION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is there any authority for the practice of saying the four words: *Domine non sum dignus, alta voce* and then concluding the remainder of the formula *submissa voce*?

RUSTICUS.

REPLY.

Before his own Communion in the Mass, the celebrant recites the four words in question in what we may term the middle tone (*elevata aliquantulum voce*) while he continues the rest of the formula secretly (*secrete prosequitur*). This is the direction of the rubrics of the Missal. In giving Communion to the faithful, he says the words: *Ecce Agnus Dei, etc.*, and the whole of the *Domine non sum dignus, etc.*, in the loud voice (*alta voce*)—as we learn from the Ritual (Titulus IV, cap. II, n. 3). There is thus no authority for the practice referred to, for the formula before Communion is never said partly in the loud voice and partly secretly: it is sometimes said entirely in the loud voice, and sometimes partly in the middle voice and partly in secret.

* * * *

IMPOSITION OF THE BISHOP'S HAND AT CONFIRMATION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

When comparing the rite of Confirmation as administered by a Bishop with the rite prescribed for a Priest having the necessary faculties to administer the same, I found that while the Priest signs the candidate on the forehead with the chrism, at the same time he places the right hand on his head. The Pontifical does not direct the Bishop to place his hand on the candidate's head at all.

1. Would it follow that the validity of the Priest's administration depends on both the signing on the forehead and the imposition of the right hand?

2. Why is it that approved authors, v.g., Martinucci (l. VII, c. 2, n. 38) when dealing with the rite of Confirmation direct the Bishop to act in the same way as the Ritual prescribes for a Priest?

VICTOR.

REPLY.

1. There is a discrepancy between the Rubrics of the Pontifical and those of the Ritual; and what is more, between the two sets of Rubrics which are to be found in the Pontifical itself. In the first Part of the Pontifical where we find the Rite for administering the Sacrament to several, the Bishop is not directed to place his right hand on the head of the candidate but merely to anoint him on the forehead with his thumb. In the description of the ceremony where there is only one person to be confirmed the rubrics are the same as those of the Ritual: *imposita manu dextra super caput confirmandi, producit pollice signum crucis in fronte illius etc.* Confirmation should be given by the imposition of the hand with the anointing with chrism on the forehead and by the words prescribed in the pontifical books approved by the Church. (Can. 780).

The imposition of hands and the anointing should be done at the one time: but what imposition is required for the validity? When the Bishop anoints the forehead with his thumb, there is physical contact between his hand and the head of the candidate, and this seems to be sufficient imposition of hands. However, Cappello (*De Sacramentis*, Vol. I, n. 192) holds that the Bishop should anoint the forehead so that at the same time he really imposes his hand, at least in some sense: to anoint the forehead with the extended thumb without any bringing up and imposition of the hand would make the Sacrament invalid, or at any rate doubtful. This may be so, if the action of the Bishop could be called an anointing with the thumb, and in no sense an imposition of the hand; but we think that in actual practice there would always be an imposition of the Bishop's right hand, morally speaking; which is sufficient when we take into account that there is actual contact at the thumb.

We do not see that the actions necessary for validity to be performed by a Priest in administering the sacrament of Confirmation can differ from those set down for the Bishop. The matter of the Sacrament is the imposition of the hand and the simultaneous anointing with chrism; and as long as the Priest with the necessary authorization applies the matter of the Sacrament and recites the words of the form, there does not seem to be any doubt as to validity. As a matter of interest, we have before us a *Rituale* published at the Propaganda Press in 1864 which contains the Decree of the S. Congregation of 21st March, 1774, concerning Confirmation given by a simple Priest, and the formula to be used. There is no direction, as is in the later Ritual, to place his hand on the head of the candidate, but he is to place the extremity of

the thumb of his right hand in the chrism, say *Signo te signo Crucis* while making the sign of the cross on the forehead of the candidate and continue: *et confirmo te etc.* We may be sure that Priests often administered this Sacrament and did not place their right hands definitely on the heads of the candidates, though the anointing of the forehead was done in such a way that it was morally also an imposition of the hand. The validity of such Confirmations is not questioned.

2. We may infer that the approved authors, among them Martinnucci (l.c.), direct the Bishop to act in the same way as the Ritual prescribes for the Priest to make sure that there will be an imposition of hands and not merely an anointing. Catalano in his Commentary of the Pontificale (vol. 1, Tit. I, n. XIV. Paris, 1801), quotes as follows: Perhaps it will not be irrelevant to commend a rite prescribed by Benedict XIII in the act of anointing with chrism: The Bishop in making the sign of the Cross on the forehead of the candidate places the right hand, with which he makes the cross, on the head of the candidate, by this one act thus joining the anointing with the imposition of hands. Although this new rubric was not admitted into the recent editions of the Roman Pontifical out of reverence for the liturgical text which should not lightly be added to, nevertheless, this practice is in no wise contrary to the letter of the Pontifical and has as its author and patron a Pope renowned for his knowledge of the sacred ceremonies, who confirmed it by his Apostolic authority in a certain Extract from the Roman Pontifical which was published at Rome by order of His Holiness in the year 1725. This quotation may shed some light on our correspondent's difficulty.

*

*

*

*

THE BENEDICTIO LOCI.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Would there be any reason why the *Benedictio loci* is not found in the useful Baltimore Ritual? This is one Blessing which would commonly be used by the Australian Clergy when they celebrate Mass at country stations.

PAROCHUS.

REPLY.

It would doubtless be convenient if the compiler of the Baltimore Ritual had included the *Benedictio Loci* among the Blessings it contains. However, for the purpose referred to by PAROCHUS it is not necessary to use any Blessing, though it would certainly be fitting that

a Blessing be given to a profane place before Mass is celebrated therein. The Code of Canon Law (Can. 1196) says that domestic oratories are not to be blessed as churches, and that these and semi-public oratories may be given the common blessing for a place or a house. By analogy, the same blessing could be given to a hall or house before Mass. We suggest that the *Asperges* which will be found in the Missal after the rite of blessing of Holy Water will suit the purpose., as it is identical with the *Benedictio Domorum* in the Ritual if we omit the versicle and and response: *Ostende nobis Domine, misericordiam tuam etc.* The same Blessing is in the Baltimore Ritual at the commencement of the rite of Communion of the Sick, but it has also a versicle and response not found in the *Benedictio Domorum*, viz., *Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini etc.*

*

*

*

*

USE OF BIRETTA. PRAYERS AT A REQUIEM MASS.
DISPOSAL OF THE ABLUTIONS WHEN BINATING
IN DIFFERENT CHURCHES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. When returning to the Sacristy after a function when the celebrant wears a cope, v.g., Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, does he bow to the Cross, before or after he removes his biretta?

2. What prayers are to be recited in a *Missa Quotidiana Requiem*?

3. What is the correct way to dispose of the ablutions after the first Mass on Sunday, when the second Mass is to be celebrated in a distant Church?

L.B.P.

REPLY.

1. When the celebrant returns to the sacristy wearing the cope, his hands are not occupied, and so he removes the biretta before bowing to the cross or principal image of the sacristy. On returning from Low Mass, however, he is carrying the chalice. He cannot remove the biretta till he has first put down the chalice, and so he bows with head covered.

2. In celebrating a *Missa Quotidiana Requiem Mass*, the three prayers are arranged thus: 1. according to the intention of the Mass, v.g., *pro uno defuncto* or *pro pluribus defunctis*, etc. 2. at the choice of the celebrant, i.e., any of the prayers among the *Orationes diversae pro defunctis*, and 3. the prayer *Fidelium*. Should the Mass not be offered for some departed soul or souls, or should the celebrant not

know exactly the intention of the person who has requested the Mass, the first prayer will be *Deus, veniae largitor*. If the Mass be offered for all the Faithful departed, it will be ordered as it stands in the Missal. (cf. *Audit. et Variat.* Tit. III, n. 10).

3. The Instruction of the S.C.R. (11th March, 1858) directs that the Priest dispose of the water of the ablutions according to circumstances:—He may leave it till the morrow, if he is to say Mass in this Church again on that day, and then pour it into the chalice at the ablutions of to-morrow's Mass; or he may soak it up in cotton-wool and have it burned; or he may pour it into the sacrarium. The S.C.R. in answer to a question (9th May, 1893, n. 3798, 5) replied that he may take it with him in a bottle, and consume it at the ablutions of the second Mass. If there be no sacrarium at a country Church, the end of the law seems to be obtained by pouring the water into the ground at some spot where there is no likelihood of its being treated unworthily.

JAMES MADDEN.

Homiletics

INSTRUCTIONS FOR MEN: VI.

PROOF OF CHRIST'S CLAIMS.

Recapitulation:

In previous talks we spoke of the necessity for the bearer of a divine revelation to produce proof of his authority to speak to us for God. If revelation is to be of any benefit to men, they must know for certain that it IS indeed revelation—God's word, not man's—The messenger from God must be able to invoke divine power to testify to divine authority. He must work miracles.

We later examined the records of Christ's life, and we came to the conclusion that in the Gospels we have a truthful reliable account of what Christ said and did.

In our most recent discussion we focussed our attention on the claims of Christ. We found that He made clear and repeated claims to be divinely commissioned to proclaim to men a message from God . . . that He went further and actually asserted that He was Himself divine.

Persevering in our search for truth we come logically now to the investigation of such proof as Christ adduced to back up this astounding claim. Did He, we must enquire, produce any miraculous signs of divine authority? We have the Gospels, we can trust them as truthful witnesses of what He did . . . Do we find in them that He did miracles?

The Gospels are full of miracles. They are not a character-study of Christ . . . they are not even primarily a record of His teaching. They are first and foremost an account of the marvels that He did. The Christ of the Gospels is definitely a miracle-man.

No man in history created more excitement amongst the people of his day. The whole country was in a ferment. Wherever He went, crowds dogged His footsteps . . . men, women and children left their work and abandoned their houses to follow Him around the country and even into the desert. Partisan feeling ran high: some, He inspired with such devotion that at His majestic command they left all they had to become His disciples; others were filled with such fanatical hatred of Him that they sought and finally accomplished His murder. Some crowds tried to make Him King: other mobs tried to stone Him. The Jewish authorities feared an outbreak of violence that would give the Romans excuse to intervene and take complete control of the country.

It was not His religious teaching that caused all this uproar... much of that seemed to be over the heads of even His most devoted followers. It was certainly not an appeal to national feeling—He spurned the attempts to proclaim Him as King, He even defended the payment of tribute to the foreign oppressor... What caused all the excitement was the astounding claim He made to divinity and the endless variety and staggering number of miracles that He worked to support His claims. The multitudes that flocked to Him came not to hear a good sermon or to join a national army... they came to obtain or to see miracles. Even His enemies regarded Him as a magician... Herod for this reason had long sought to see Him. The Jewish priests who jeered at Him "Come down from the cross" were acknowledging His reputation as a miracle-worker. Even the Roman authorities who permitted the sealing and guarding of His tomb were recognising His boast to rise from the dead.

Many thousands of His contemporaries believed that He did rise from the dead. That does not of itself prove His resurrection—but it does prove His miracles... for how could so many have been induced to believe the staggering tale of His reappearance from the tomb unless they had previously seen or heard of His amazing miracles? Those miracles were so many and performed under such various circumstances; witnessed by so many, both friends and foes; checked and investigated, some of them, so thoroughly that they could not be explained away by any theory of mass-hypnotism, auto-suggestion or fraud. Nor can they now be so explained away by us unless we are to believe that gospel-writers were crazy liars, and the Palestine of the first century largely populated by lunatics. We have gone into all that in a previous instruction. Let us now take a closer look at some of these miracles.

He worked miracles on inanimate nature. He was crossing the Sea of Galilee in a fishing boat; and as they sailed He slept. Suddenly there swept down upon the lake one of those violent squalls that can transform that usually placid body of water into a raging maelstrom. The Apostles were professional fishermen, skilled in handling their small craft and thoroughly familiar with these treacherous waters. They had weathered many such storms, but this time the sea had them beaten. They were done for... And so they awakened Him, crying more in despair than faith, "Save us, we perish." He rose up and spoke to the wind and the sea. "Peace," He said, "Be still." And immediately there came a great calm. The seamen, who had a moment before been terrified of the storm, were now overcome with awe of that majestic figure, that had spoken to the elements—and been obeyed. Those men

knew the sea—and they knew that what they had seen was something terrifyingly supernatural...they knew that it was no mere moderation of the weather, they knew that they had seen a stupendous miracle. Either they are liars or the Lord of the Sea stood in their boat.

At the marriage feast of Cana He changed a large quantity of water into the choicest wine. On two occasions He fed thousands of hungry people to repletion with a few loaves and a few small fishes. Now, suggestion may be able to accomplish many marvellous things, but it would take a lot of persuading to make hungry people imagine they had just had a good meal, or wedding guests that they were enjoying good wine when they were really drinking water.

But, as became so kindly and compassionate a man, most of His miracles were done to cure the sick. From far and wide people brought their sick ones to Him: they fought their way through the crowds to Him, they even climbed the roofs and let down their stretchers on ropes before Him. No illness was incurable to Him—with a word, a touch, or even at a distance He restored sufferers to health. The maimed, the lame, the deaf, the dumb, the blind, the paralytic, the lunatic, the leper—all obtained instant and complete cure at His hands. Some of the diseases He cured are still incurable to-day after nineteen hundred years of advance in medical knowledge. More, some of His cures involved the restoration of parts wasted or destroyed. Modern science still seeks in vain a cure for leprosy...but what they have hope of finding some day will be at most a "negative cure"—a halting of the progress of the disease. There is no hope of ever restoring parts destroyed by the disease—there is simply no mechanism in the human body for growing a new hand or foot—Christ restored many lepers to instant vital complete health. Some of His cures were wrought in the presence of completely hostile and unbelieving audiences—some were thoroughly investigated by authorities who wanted above all to find evidence of imposture or fraud. No one who imagines that Christ's contemporaries were hysterical or credulous has read the ninth Chapter of St. John's gospel.

Men were amazed and excited by Christ's power over disease: They were shocked into awed silence by His mastery of death. The super-human physician revealed Himself as the Lord of Life. The Gospels give detailed accounts of three cases where Christ raised the dead to life. It is sometimes difficult to know exactly when a person is dead. Artificial resuscitation sometimes causes lung action to re-commence in the apparently dead from drowning: and we have read of cases where surgeons have, by massaging the heart, started again the vital

functions when they had ceased. But there can be no doubt that a man, dead four days, whose body is already putrifying, is beyond human aid. Such was the case with Lazarus, whom Christ called forth from the tomb. Lazarus was a man of substance and social position: his funeral had been attended by many prominent Jews: quite a number of notable persons were still in the house consoling the bereaved family when the miracle was performed. Both the fact of death and the miracle of resurrection were so well attested that Christ's enemies were at their wit's end to know how to hush the matter up. They even plotted the assassination of Lazarus that they might destroy this living evidence of the divine power of Christ.

They changed their plans: they killed Christ Himself, and so set the stage for the most stupendous miracle of all. For, as He had foretold, on the third day after His death, He rose again to life. The Resurrection is an historical fact. As one writer puts it, there is more convincing historical proof of it than there is of Caesar's landing in Britain. No one, of course, denies that Caesar did land in Britain: that can have no practical effect upon our lives. But if Christ rose from the dead He is God, and His law the voice of God... So many now, like the Jews, try to explain away the empty tomb. But they cannot now, as the Jews could not then, shake the testimony of those hundreds of witnesses who saw Him, and spoke with Him and ate with Him, and handled Him during the forty days that followed His resurrection. They were not easily convinced these witnesses: Thomas was typical of them all. But once Christ has succeeded in demonstrating to them that He had really risen, neither threats nor promises could keep them quiet. So convincing was their testimony that within a few weeks thousands had accepted their story: within a few years hundreds of thousands. St. Augustine says that had the Resurrection not been a fact, the conversion of the world to belief in it would have been as great a miracle as the Resurrection itself.

Christ, then, was a worker of miracles. He did things no man ever did before Him, nor any man since: things no man *can* do unless God be with him. What claims He made, God backed up. But He claimed to be the Son of God with a divine message for, and a divine power over all men. How that message was to reach, how that power to be exercised over all men we shall discuss at another time. We have come this far at present: Christ made certain claims, and produced evidence in abundance in support of those claims. Logically we must accept Him as what He claimed to be. We might ignore Christ: we cannot explain Him away.

W. BAKER.

Notes

Few psalms are recited so frequently in the Divine Office as Psalm 44. Besides its use in the first nocturne on Wednesdays, it occurs also in the Office of the Nativity of Our Lord and in that of the Circumcision, the Holy Name, the Sacred Heart, and the Transfiguration. It is used, too, for Feasts of THE NUPTIALS OF THE KING Our Lady and of the Apostles. Moreover, most of the verses are also used individually for antiphons in the Office and for introits and graduals in the Mass. Some explanation of a psalm that is used so much, may not be unwelcome.

Psalm 44 is perhaps the most lyrical of all the psalms, and that is understandable; for it describes the marriage of a great King to a rich princess. The occasion is one of great rejoicing, and rich blessings are to flow out to future ages from these royal nuptials. Indeed, the inspired writer is so thrilled by what he sees and foresees that he must pour out his song as quickly as possible.

There is no doubt that the psalm is Messianic. It is quoted among other Messianic passages in the first chapter of *Hebrews*, and both Jewish and Christian tradition regard it as referring to the Messiah. All the Fathers of the Church who comment on this psalm agree that under the figure of a marriage the psalm celebrates the union of Christ with His Church. We can no more take this psalm in a merely natural sense than we can take the *Canticle of Canticles* in such a sense.

The psalm falls easily into four divisions:—

- A. The prologue: verse 2.
- B. An address to the King: verses 3-10.
- C. An address to the Queen: verses 11-16.
- D. The epilogue, which looks to the future: verses 17 and 18.

As the new version of the Psalms approved by Pius XII is rapidly coming into use among priests, the following commentary will give first the Latin text of this new version, then a literal translation. Even a casual reading of this psalm in the new version will reveal considerable differences from the Vulgate. The reasons for these various changes will not be discussed here: the purpose of this article is to bring out the meaning of the psalm as the new critical version gives it to us.

A. *The Prologue.*

2. *Effundit cor meum verbum bonum;
dico ego carmen meum regi;
lingua mea stilus est scribae velocis.*

My heart is overflowing with a noble theme:

I am reciting my poem for a King;

my tongue is the pen of a rapid writer.

The psalmist is, so to say, all agog. He has a great and noble theme for his song, and it is all for a King. Like the pen of a well-trained and able scribe, his tongue readily fits words to thoughts, and so he can plunge straight into his subject.

B. *The Royal Bridegroom.*

First the psalmist describes His comeliness:—

3. *Speciosus es forma prae filiis hominum,
diffusa est gratia super labia tua:
propterea benedixit tibi Deus in aeternum.*

You are fairer of form than the children of men,

grace has been poured out upon your lips:

therefore God has blessed you for ever.

The King has a royal and manly beauty that is something more than human, something not seen in the rest of men. His winning smile lights up his countenance, and his gracious speech betrays the true love of his soul for his subjects. It is quite clear that God has blessed the King; yes, blessed him for ever!

In the light of the fact that this psalm is undoubtedly Messianic, we can see in the King's more-than-human beauty that beauty that befits Him who is hypostatically united to the divinity. The gracious speech of the King we may illustrate from the Gospels. St. Luke tells us that at Nazareth itself "all bore witness to him and marvelled at the words of grace that came from his mouth" (4: 22), and that when He taught in the Temple "all the people hung upon his words" (19: 48). St. John records that the men sent to arrest Our Lord in the Temple during the Feast of Tabernacles returned empty-handed. "No man," they said, "ever spoke as this man speaks" (7: 46).

4. *Cinge gladium tuum super femur, potentissime,
decorem tuum et ornatum tuum!*

Gird your sword upon (your) thigh, O mighty one,

(even) your glory and your majesty!

The arms of this great King are not material weapons: they are the

divine attributes of "glory and majesty."¹ These attributes belong to him by right, just as does a king's own sword hanging by his side, the symbol of his authority.

The poet next speaks of the King's prowess:—

5. *Feliciter evehere pro fide et pro iustitia,
et praeclara gesta doceat te dextera tua,*

Ride happily on in the cause of faithfulness and justice,
and let your right hand teach you wonderful deeds.

When rule is weak, fidelity, justice, and all other virtues suffer, but where order is enforced and evil repressed, fidelity and righteousness can flourish. In *Isaias* 11: 4-9 these very virtues are mentioned as characteristic of the Messiah and his Kingdom.

The King's "right hand" denotes his strength and courage, which will manifest themselves in wonderful achievements. No enemy will be able to withstand him:—

6. *Sagittae tuae acutae, populi tibi subduntur,
deficiunt corde inimici regis.*

Your arrows are sharp, peoples are made subject to you,
the hearts of the King's enemies fail.

When this King rides out to conquest, none can resist him. Whole peoples yield to him, and his very enemies lose heart.

In verses 7 and 8 the poet describes the Kingdom: it is stable and righteous, and the King is uniquely happy.

7. *Thronus tuus, Deus, in saeculum saeculi;
sceptrum aequitatis sceptrum regni tui.*

Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever;
a sceptre of equity is the sceptre of your Kingdom.

The King's throne is to stand for ever, and his authority is devoted to the cause of justice in all things. He is directly addressed as "God," an address that is perfectly intelligible in the light of the fulfilment of the prophecy in the Incarnation.

8. *Diligis iustitiam et odisti iniquitatem:
propterea unxit te Deus, Deus tuus,
oleo laetitiae prae consortibus tuis.*

You love righteousness and hate wickedness:
therefore God, your God, has anointed you
with the oil of gladness above your fellow kings.

Because of his love of justice God has given the King more true happiness than any other ruler has ever enjoyed. Oil mixed with per-

¹Psalms 95: 6; 103: 1; 110: 3; 144: 5.

fumes was used for anointing the body on festal occasions. Here the expression is figurative, the stress being on the King's great happiness; but the mention of oil recalls the fact that it was perfumed for joyous occasions. This leads on to a description of the King's splendour. He has been anointed with oil for the festival, and his garments now distil the sweetest odours, just as though they had been saturated with the choicest spices:—

9. *Myrrha et aloë et cassia fragrant vestimenta tua;
ex aedibus eburneis fidium sonus lætificat te.*

Your garments are sweet with myrrh and aloes and cassia;
from ivory palaces the sound of stringed instruments makes
you glad.

Myrrh came from Arabia. Aloes is not here the bitter medicine but rather an aromatic wood, probably from India. Cassia seems to have been the powdered bark of a species of cinnamon. These perfumes represent the virtues of the Messiah and the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Apparently the King's procession is moving out to meet the bride. From within the palaces musical instruments fill the air with joyful sounds. Ivory was sometimes used to panel the walls of rich dwellings.

10. *Filiae regum obviam veniunt tibi,
regina adstat ad dexteram tuam ornata auro ex Ophir.*

Daughters of kings come to meet you,
the Queen stands at your right hand adorned with gold from
Ophir.

The two processions meet. The Queen's place is to be the one of greatest honour, and she appears adorned with the finest gold in the world.

C. *The Address to the Bride.*

The psalmist begins by warning the Bride that she must forget her former home and give herself entirely to her Lord. Then she will be honoured.

11. *Audi, filia, et vide, et inclina aurem tuam,
et obliviscere populum tuum et domum patris tui.*

Hearken, O daughter, and see, and lend your ear,
and forget your people and your father's house.

That is, Look round you, daughter, and see the glory and the magnificence of your new home, so that you can forget what you have given up. When you realize the greatness and the power of the King, then you will embrace your new life whole-heartedly and give your Lord the

devotion that so noble and great a King deserves. By abandoning all other affections you will win the King's good pleasure:—

12. *Et concupiscet rex pulchritudinem tuam;*

ipse est dominus tuus; obsequere ei.

And the King shall be enamoured of your beauty;

he is your Lord; revere him.

If, like Ruth, the Queen forgets the people from whom she is sprung and becomes a truly devoted member of the People of God, then the King will be won by her charms, but she must always remember that he is her sovereign Lord and that she must bow down before him and render him all worship and honour.

The same complete detachment and sincere self-surrender is demanded of every soul by Christ the King: "If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father and mother, and wife and children, and brothers and sisters, indeed, his own life, he can never be my disciple" (*Luke* 14: 26).

As far as the Church, the Bride of Christ, is concerned, her members must forget the paganism from which they came—they must forget the whole pagan way of life, as St. Paul warned the Ephesians (4: 17-24).

13. *Et populus Tyri cum muneribus venit;*

favorem tuum captant procures plebis.

And the people of Tyre come with presents;

(even) the leaders of the people seek your favour.

Tyre, rich from its trade, stands for all the gentiles, who will lay their treasures at the feet of the Bride of Christ. Even the most highly-placed, the most influential and the richest men in a nation, will be glad to win the Bride's approval and favour.

The following verses describe the splendid entry of the Queen into the palace of the King:—

14. *Tota decora ingreditur filia regis;*

texturae aureae sunt amictus eius.

15. *Amictu variegato induta adducitur ad regem;*

virgines post eam, sociae eius, adducuntur ad te.

16. *Afferuntur cum laetitia et exultatione,*

ingrediuntur in palatium regis.

All glorious, the daughter of the king enters;

inwrought with gold is her raiment.

Dressed in many-coloured garments she is led to the King:

after her virgins, her companions, are led to you.

They are brought in with gladness and rejoicing,
they enter the palace of the King.

The Queen is the "daughter of a king," that is, a princess. Her beautiful garments denote virtues, that is, spiritual adornments, as in the *Apocalypse*: to the Bride of the Lamb "has been given fine linen, bright and pure; the fine linen being the righteous deeds of the saints" (19: 8). St. Augustine suggests that the variegated garments represent the one Faith professed by many different tongues.

Finally, the splendid *cortège* disappears into the interior of the palace amidst great demonstrations of popular joy. The poet then looks to the future. As the Hebrew text shows, he again addresses the King, not the Queen.

D. *The Posterity of the King and Queen.*

17. *Loco patrum tuorum erunt filii tui;*

constitues eos principes super totam terram.

18. *Memorabo nomen tuum in omnem generationem et generationem;*

propterea populi celebrabunt te in saeculum saeculi.

Instead of your fathers, your sons shall appear;
you will appoint them princes over all the earth.
I will make your name known to every future age;
so the peoples shall praise you for ever and ever.

In place of the King's ancestors, sons shall appear, and they shall rule in all the earth. The Messianic nature of this psalm points to the patriarchs and prophets as the "ancestors." To these will succeed the Apostles and the pastors of Churches throughout the world. The Messiah himself stands at the dividing-line between the "fathers" and the "princes" that are to rule over the whole world.

Most Protestant commentators regard this psalm as a mere epithalamium, celebrating a purely natural and human love. They think that the occasion of the poem was the marriage of a king of Israel with a foreign princess. The psalm was admitted to the canon, in their opinion, only because the Jews gave it a Messianic interpretation. This view is contrary to Catholic tradition on the nature of the psalm and to Catholic teaching on the canon of Sacred Scripture.

Some few Protestant exegetes and several Catholic commentators hold that the psalm was written for an historic occasion, but that the particular king in question was a type of the Messiah. Thus, for

example, Father Vaccari would admit the probability of the view that the psalm was written for the marriage of Solomon with a princess from the gentiles. But, he says, the Davidic dynasty in general and Solomon himself in person were figures and precursors of David's most illustrious Son, King Messiah. The Queen could be understood to be Israel and her companions the converted gentile nations. Thus the psalm would celebrate in the typical sense the sacred ties between Christ and His Church, which is composed of the elect of Israel together with a vast company from the other nations of the world. This interpretation is probable, at least because of the fact that more than one first-class Catholic exegete subscribes to it. Yet it does not seem to be the right interpretation. The detailed examination of the text given above brought out quite a number of remarkable points. They can be listed briefly, having been explained above:—

1. The King is called God, verse 7.
2. His arms are divine attributes, verse 4.
3. His Kingdom is eternal, epilogue.
4. He appoints his "sons" princes over all the earth, verse 17.
5. He stands at the dividing-line between the patriarchs and prophets on the one hand and on the other the princes to come, verse 17.
6. Always and everywhere the nations will praise him.
7. He is the perfect King, and the poet does not venture to counsel him, as he counsels the Queen.
8. There is no question of another king to succeed him. Only his "sons" will exercise princely rule throughout the earth by his appointment.

Now, such things cannot be literally true of any mere earthly ruler, not even of Solomon in all his glory and with all his wisdom. Therefore the psalm is not typically but directly and immediately Messianic. That is, it is a literal prophecy about Christ our Lord and His Bride, the Church, though it is expressed under a figure, the figure of the closest of human relationships.

In this interpretation the main elements in the prophecy would be the following:—

1. The Bridegroom is himself King Messiah. Our Lord spoke of himself as the Bridegroom on more than one occasion, and St. John the Baptist rejoiced at "the Bridegroom's voice," whilst St. John the Evangelist speaks of "the marriage of the Lamb"

in the Apocalypse. We see, then, how appropriately this psalm is used for several of Our Lord's great Feasts.

2. The Bride is the Church. Cf. *Ephesians* 5: 22-23.
3. The Bride's companions are the local Churches, or perhaps better, souls devoted to God. Among such souls Our Lady would hold first place, and so this psalm is fittingly used in Offices of Our Lady. Moreover, after her many virgins have been led to consecrate their lives to the King.
4. The princes that are appointed to rule over the earth are the Apostles and their successors. Hence the appropriate use of this psalm in Feasts of the Apostles.

J. A. PHILLIPS, S.J.

*

*

*

*

For the sake of those who like everything signed, sealed and delivered, it is a shame that no official document can be found which would set beyond doubt the Australian patronage of Our Lady under the title *Help of Christians*.

OUR LADY, A fragment of history together with a document
HELP OF that has recently come to light, but which was quoted
CHRISTIANS. at second-hand in *A.C.R.*, Vol. XI, p. 252, may help
to convince those who still doubt that Our Lady,
Help of Christians is the principal Patroness of Australia.

In Canon 1278 of the Code, which refers back to decrees of the *S.R.C.*, 23rd March, 1630, and 27th Sept., 1659, we read: "*Laudabiliter quoque, servatis servandis, Sancti nationum, diocoesium, provinciarum, confraternitatum, familiarum religiosarum, aliorumque locorum et moralium personarum eliguntur et accedente confirmatione Sedis Apostolicæ, constituuntur Patroni...*"

At the first Provincial Synod of Australia in 1844 the Catholic public were notified that "On Thursday, a Votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin under the title *Auxilium Christianorum*, the title by which the holy Mother of God is invoked as Patroness of our Ecclesiastical Province".

The Province, at that time, comprised the whole Australian continent and Tasmania; and the Fathers of the Council were the Archbishop of Sydney, with the Bishops of Tasmania and Adelaide, together with their theologians. Twenty-seven other priests took part in the celebration of the Synod; and the assemblage apparently did a good job on the

Decreta, because Cardinal Moran, fifty years later, says: "These wise decrees have been repeated in the subsequent Synods, and may be said to form at the present day the rule of daily life for the guidance of the clergy of the Australian Church". (*History* etc., p. 440).

Men competent enough to frame laws so wisely for new conditions in a new country would hardly be likely to ignore the *S.R.C.* decrees when discussing the question of the Patronage of the Province for which they were legislating. But the documents then compiled for submission to the Holy See were to travel widely before they reached their destination.

Cardinal Moran tells us the story:

"It was not without difficulty, however, that the acts and decrees of the First Provincial Council of Australia escaped the fate of being consigned to untimely oblivion. The Right Rev. Dr. Pompallier, Bishop of New Zealand, arrived in Sydney a few days after the close of the Synod, and expressed a wish to read its decrees which might serve for his future guidance. The manuscript and the documents connected with the Synod were consigned to him, and were, by mistake, all packed up in his luggage when he was setting out sometime afterwards for the Islands of the Pacific. It was only in the year 1846 that they were brought back to Sydney. In 1847, the Archbishop presented them to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda during his personal visit to Rome, but the disturbances in the Eternal City and the revolutionary proceedings throughout Italy at that eventful period made all further action in regard to them impossible, and it was only when peace was restored to Rome, and the congregations had resumed their routine work, that in 1852 the decrees of the first Australian Synod with a few alterations received the approval of the Holy See".

However, despite the political upsets, Archbishop Polding was able to present a *supplex libellus* to the Holy Father and to get a decision straightway. And that is the document that the *A.C.R.* is able to bring to notice:

Beatissime Pater:

Joannes Beda Polding Archiepiscopus Sydneiensis ad pedes Sanctitatis tue provolutus humillime supplicat ut benigne dignetur, attento quod in Synodo Provinciali Sydneiensi determinatum fuerit ut Beatissima Virgo Maria invocaretur sub titulo Auxilii Christianorum veluti Patrona Australiae die 24 Maii, concedere Indulgentiam Plenariam singulis Christifidelibus qui confessi et SS. Eucharistia refectionis ad Deum preces fuderint in quacumque parte Provinciae Sydneiensis

juxta intentionem Summi Pontificis et pro prosperitate Sanctae Matris Ecclesiae et supplicatur insuper ut haec indulgentia per modum sufragii animabus Defunctorum applicari. Quare, etc.

Ex audientia SSmi habita die 25 Aprilis 1847, SS. Dominus Noster Pius Divina Providentia PP. IX, referente me infrascripto Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide officiali, propensis expositis benigne annuit pro gratia juxta preces contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus. Datur Romae ex aed. dic. Sac.Cong.nis die et anno quibus supra.

G. B. PALMA

S.Cong.nis Officialis".

The words underlined in the *libellus* would seem to indicate satisfactorily that the *election* of Our Lady, Help of Christians as Patroness was carried out in the form required by the S.R.C. decrees; and in the grant, the *propensis expositis* would indicate, at least, sufficient confirmation by the Holy See.

Auxilium Christianorum, Patrona totius Australiae, Ora pro nobis; ut digni efficiamur promissionibus Christi.

J. J. McGOVERN.

*

*

*

*

The recent amendments to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act gave rise to a controversy amongst Catholics as well as non-Catholics. Some Catholic critics have pointed to the legal formalism of the Arbitration Court and applauded the new departure towards conciliation. Others have contended that arbitration has established system and law in industry; that as such, it should be retained, and to it should be added a stronger conciliation arm. Into this controversy the name of Judge Higgins was quite naturally introduced. Besides virtually founding the Court, and doing so according to the high aspirations of national service and social justice, Higgins presided over the Court for fourteen years. And as the mariner, who having guided his craft on many a voyage has much of value to say about it, so this first great president has much to say on the Court. Guided by the beacon of justice, he steered it, as a vessel, through the shoals and shallows of industrial strife to the haven of industrial peace. Naturally, controversialists invoked him, and a study of his estimate of the Court well repays any interested in a considered judgment of this topic. What then, has he to tell us of conciliation and arbi-

tration? Has he anything relevant to the present controversy? His comments, apart from his judgments, are found in his small, but informative book, "A New Province for Law and Order," published in 1922. From it extracts with page annotations will be freely taken.

"A New Province for Law and Order" was written mainly in answer to criticism of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. Before going on to discuss Higgins' treatment of this criticism, it is worth while making a note on the criticism itself. It bears a striking resemblance to the criticism we hear to-day, and because of that, it throws a valuable sidelight on much of the current clamour for reform. The criticism of yesterday and to-day is the same. There is too much arbitration and not enough conciliation. But the critics of yesterday are the supporters of to-day. Then, the employers criticised, and the unions applauded. "I have found that in Great Britain, as well as in America, the idea of compulsory arbitration is repugnant to the leaders of the working class, whereas in Australia, facing different stars, opposition comes principally from the class of employers." P. 30. To-day, the employers applaud and the unions criticise. The explanation is probably that "the party with a stronger economic position naturally wants to be free to act as it thinks fit; it objects to being bound by orders from outside." P. 40. The employers, about whom these words were written, were strong in 1907; the unions are strong in 1948. This change on the unions' part could arise, therefore, not so much from a desire for a better system of industrial relations or a sense of justice, as from a desire to exploit, as the employers did before them, a "stronger economic position." This tilt of the scales of power in labour's favour, with its accompanying change from enthusiasm for arbitration, is a factor to be stressed in a realistic evaluation of the present movement for reform.

To the charge that the Court favoured arbitration at the expense of conciliation, Higgins made careful and repeated replies. "The process of conciliation with arbitration in the background is substituted for the rude and barbarous processes of strike and lock-out." P.2. "The Act makes it the first duty of the Court to endeavour to get agreement on matters in dispute, and to exercise its compulsory powers only when an agreement is impossible." P. 40. "Compulsion may be applied at either of two points—compulsion to submit to arbitration before strike, and compulsion to obey the award...under the Australian Act, both kinds of compulsion are applicable;...The ideal of the Court is to get such a regulation as the parties ought to put in a collective agreement:

and compulsion merely means that as to claims on which the parties cannot agree, the Court can make an award." P. 108. A further remark has a topical ring. "Some persons seeing only what the Court awards have the notion that the Court's proceedings are confined to compulsory awards—resisted awards...It is due to an unfortunate ignorance arising from a failure to study the Court's doings that we sometimes find leader writers speaking of the Court as putting employers and employees in hostile arrays. They are in hostile arrays already, Court or no Court; but the Court brings them together as round a table and compels them, in each array, to consider each others' difficulties, and to deal with proposals on lines of reason rather than force, of right rather than might." P. 139. These words distinguish three possibilities in the control of industrial relations.

1. Voluntary agreement between the parties—Conciliation.
2. Compulsory award made by the State's judicial power—Arbitration.
3. Compulsory settlements through economic might—Strike or Lock-out.

In order of preference, voluntary agreement is the ideal; arbitration is a second resort; and the strike and lock-out are the evils to be avoided at the cost of arbitration. There is no doubt, therefore, of the mind of the Court's founder. For him arbitration was to play a "background" role. It was to be resorted to only when the better—collective agreement—was wanting, and when the worse—collective disagreement—the strike or lock-out, was threatening.

Were deeds as good as words? "The truth is that in consequence of the Court's settled standards there is now more of agreement than of compulsory order, more of conciliation than arbitration." P. 139. "It is surprising to find how often as the principles of the Court's action come to be understood and appreciated, they guide parties disputing to friendly agreements, without any award by the Court." P. 6. "Frequently...the union and the employers, after a study of the system adopted by the Court in analagous cases make an agreement without any hearing, and the agreement is certified and filed and thereby becomes an award." P. 91. All this means that arbitration by its formation of an industrial code led to the very conciliation it was condemned for excluding. The parties got to know the rules of the game, and were glad to play under them. The much-maligned arbitration actually fostered the much-desired conciliation. The Court's history under Higgins, therefore, has much, in theory and practice, to show what the Court in itself

has been, and possibly still could be, as an instrument for conciliation as well as arbitration.

The success of the Court as an instrument of industrial peace was an equally enviable one. While strikers were numerous under State jurisdiction during the period 1907-1920, there were no strikes subject to the Commonwealth Court's jurisdiction between 1904-1915, three only during the war years 1914-1918, and three only during the post war years, November, 1918, to December, 1920. And it should be noted that the war time strikes under Commonwealth jurisdiction were not against Court awards. The 1916 coal strike was against conscription; the 1917 railways' strike was subject to State jurisdiction, but brought out in sympathy the seamen who were subject to the Commonwealth Court; the 1919 seamen's strike was due almost entirely to government intervention in the fixing of awards. This is a remarkable record, judged by our experience. It must be admitted that the Court was under the guidance of a zealous president, that federal unions were not so numerous then, and that industrial life was not so complex. Yet notwithstanding all this, to the Court for whose reform there is such a clamour to-day, must be attributed the unique success of giving to its jurisdiction an era of unbroken peace from 1904 to 1915.

The factor to which Higgins attributed the Court's successful operation in the cause of peace is worthy of special mention. It is consistency of awards in an industry and between industries. "The awards must be consistent one with the other or else comparisons breed unnecessary restlessness, discontent, industrial trouble. P. 41. "Due proportion must be maintained between the several ratings or classes in one industry, and indeed between several industries. To purchase present relief from strike pressure by the tampering with the balanced system of the legitimate tribunal invites further strikes." P. 86. The standard of consistency of awards implied in these words has been so proved by successful experiment that, so far from being ignored, it should be carefully consulted in any attempt at reform. It is timely, therefore, to ask, have these elements of consistency and balance been promoted, or at least safeguarded, by recent legislation? One group of Catholics fears it has not. The new Act, they say, sets up fifteen conciliation commissioners with arbitral powers equivalent to those formerly exercised by a judge, in all matters save certain basic ones like the basic wage, standard hours, annual leave and female rates of pay. As well as acting in their own sphere quite independently of the judges, these commissioners can also, unlike the individual judges before them,

act quite independently of one another. There is no court of appeal from a commissioner's award. There is no appeal to Chief Commissioner or full board of commissioners. There is no provision for a systematising authority to bring the commissioners into consistency with one another. This may lead to unco-ordinated awards within an industry and between industries. It is this defect, it is feared, which will destroy the system built up laboriously over the years, and again bring the restlessness, discontent, and industrial trouble against which Higgins ably fought. If this criticism is true, and there seems to be grounds for saying it is, the new legislation must face the criticism of having ignored the vital maxim of consistency of awards laid down, and successfully applied, by Higgins.

That Higgins, in view of his experience, can throw much valuable light on the Court's nature and possibilities, and in view of his success provide criterions for the Court's guidance, seems a reasonable conclusion. The situation which the Court faces to-day is not substantially different from what it was in his day. The two armies—labour and capital—have transformed the labour market into an arena, where they are engaged in fierce combat. It matters little which party has the dominant position. What matters is that, when reform is mooted, the superior force, disliking the restraint of the Court, will endeavour to modify it to its own advantage. Accordingly, it is a subject for hope that those, in whose hands the future of the Court lies, will resist such endeavour; that they will not ignore entirely the admonitions of the Court's founder, and that with his high regard for national welfare, make it, instead of an instrument for sectional advantage, an institution for common welfare and social justice.

P. P. FORD.

Book Reviews

THE NEW TESTAMENT. Douay Version. Edited by J. P. Arendzen, D.D., D.Ph., M.A. London, Sheed and Ward, 1947. Price, Rexine Binding 8/6 English; cloth 6/-.

The joint approval given to Mgr. Knox's New Testament by the Hierarchy of England and Wales has by no means displaced the Rheims-Challoner Testament. Many will value the fidelity of the old version more than the smooth, modern, very intelligible English of Mgr. Knox. And while time is forming its ultimate judgment of approval or disapproval of the new version, many will want to possess the old for occasional reference, or for purposes of comparison. Hence the utility of the present edition prepared by the veteran scholar, Dr. Arendzen.

Nothing need be said about the text. It is the current form of the Rheims-Challoner Bible that has been used in England since Cardinal Wiseman's time. It is well-printed, carefully paragraphed, and has the verse numbers on the margin instead of within the lines.

The notes are well distributed throughout the various books. Some of them are of considerable length, and almost all of them uniformly good. But in names and numbers it is easy even for "good Homer" to nod. On page 4 Felix stands instead of Festus. The names in St. Luke's genealogy of Our Lord are not 72 but 77. As examples of admirable notes we might cite that on the Petrine text, that on the hope of Christians under 2 Cor. 5, that on the royal priesthood mentioned by St. Peter, p. 538 f., the pithy little remark with reference to the inspiration of Scripture on p. 547 (this however somewhat faultily worded), and the excellent comment on the "great sign in heaven" (Apoc. 12: 1). The note on the millennium at the bottom of page 603 is particularly admirable.

We may remark that Dr. Arendzen is very fair in stating opinions. Annotating the genealogy of Christ at the beginning of St. Matthew's Gospel he gives first place and full weight to the more common opinion. Years ago, in his book of essays on the Gospels, he gave his personal preference to the opinion which he here mentions in the second place.

We should like to see more information embodied in some of the introductory notices to the single books. No doubt the size of the volume was decisive here. The actual size seems ideal. It is altogether a very convenient and useful edition of the Douay New Testament.

W.L.

"THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE FUTURE LIFE," by Edmund F. Sutcliffe, S.J., distributed by Burns, Oates and Washbourne Ltd., 1946. Pp. 193 and Index. Publishing Price, 16/3.

Fr. Sutcliffe needs no introduction. Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Hebrew at Heythrop College, he is the General Editor of the Bellarmine Series published by the Jesuit Fathers from that centre. The work under review is the eighth of the series and the author's second contribution. By it he further enhances the collection he inaugurated with his "A Two Year Public Ministry" in 1939. Number 8 represents substantially a series of lectures given in 1942-3 as one of the special courses required for the Licentiate in Theology. A general survey is made of the beliefs of Israel on the lot of man in the hereafter, tracing the manifest advance in those beliefs from "the simplicity, and, it can almost be said, the crudity" of Patriarchal days and long after until the last stages of their history before the coming of Christ.

After introducing chapters on Egyptian and Babylonian ideas of the future life, passages of the Old Testament, particularly the Pentateuch, reflecting the ancient and imperfect ideas of the Hebrews are examined. From the beginning they believed in the survival of man, though their ideas of what existence after death was like were negative and vague. The author essays a general description of these largely negative notions of Sheol, the resting place of the dead. There follows an examination of certain passages from the Psalms which might seem at first sight to express a more developed and lofty doctrine.

In the final chapters the author sets forth the teaching found in the latest books of the Old Testament on rewards and punishments after death, on the resurrection, on the adumbrations of the intermediate state which we call Purgatory. A chapter on the Constituents of Man seeks an answer to the question what part of man was believed by the Israelites to survive death. The final chapter deals with the views on the future life to be found in the extra-canonical books written before the Time of Christ. Following this plan, Fr. Sutcliffe successfully accomplishes the task he set himself—"to give the reader an adequate presentation of the world of ideas concerning man's future existence into which burst the revelation of the New Testament"—and by so doing he increases the indebtedness to him of Scripture scholars the world over.

J.C.

*

*

*

*

THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN. By. R. J. Loenertz, O.P.
Translated by Hilary J. Carpenter, O.P. London, Sheed and Ward. Price, 8/6 English.

The Apocalypse is undoubtedly an obscure book, a book of proverbial obscurity. Catholics who are traditionally humble in the presence of divine obscurity, have always thought this book much more difficult to interpret than the Protestant who prides himself on a sort of charism of private interpretation. Hence, in the language of the Catholic people of France, a speaker whose thought is difficult to follow is said "to speak like the Apocalypse", and the style of a writer who indulges in rather incomprehensible metaphor or allegory is dubbed "the style of the Apocalypse".

It is to be feared, however, that this reputation of the Apocalypse keeps too many from reading it. The Dominican author of the book before us (presumably a man in middle life or older) confesses that he had never read it in its entirety before the year of grace 1941. He realized then that his shyness in the face of apocalyptic obscurity was a mistake, and we hope that his book will make many others realize the same. With all its obscurity the Revelation of John the Divine is a most consoling, encouraging, heartening book. It is preeminently the book of Christian patience, of the eternal confidence of Christ's militant Church, of the assurance of the victory of which the Founder of the Church spoke when He said: "Have confidence, I have conquered the world".

We shall not attempt to praise or blame Father Loenertz's book in detail. The reason is that its some 160 pages need to be read very slowly and with very close attention, and this we have not been able to do. However, a rapid reading has impressed us very favourably. Father Loenertz, who is not a biblical specialist but a theologian, wrote because he believed that he had made a discovery which puts in a better light the marvellous structure of the Apocalypse. Everyone who has ever read this inspired book has adverted to the predominance in it of the number seven. Seven letters to the Churches, seven seals, seven trumpets, seven vials emerge from the explicit words of the text. These four septenaries were noted in all commentaries. Crampon's French Bible directed the attention of Father Loenertz to the fact that the "great sign" of chap. 12: 1 is the first of a series of seven "signs"—between the trumpets and the vials. Again, counting the recurrent phrase "I saw", the Father discovered a septenary of "visions" beginning with that of the Rider of the white horse. Being now in possession of six septenaries, he naturally suspected that there must be a seventh. The section on the Great Babylon after the vials yielded up the secret that it holds seven "voices". This makes the Apocalypse a septenary

of septenaries—letters, seals, trumpets, signs, vials, voices, visions (of the end).

A priori such a scheme of composition is very credible, and a posteriori (as far as we have been able to examine the matter) it seems really probable, if not certain. Prior to Father Loenertz, a Scripture Professor of Louvain Father Levie, S.J., had made the same discovery; and we believe that it is to be found substantially in Father Martindale's brilliant little book on the Apocalypse. Let those who read verify this last fact, for it is years since we had Father Martindale's book in our hand and cannot consult it just now. A system of dovetailing recognizable in the Apocalypse makes the distinction of the septenaries somewhat difficult, but Father Loenertz sets it before us quite well in his introduction, in his well-divided edition of the text, and in his commentary. The commentary is mainly an analytic sketch embodying short explanations drawn from Father Allo's classic work in the series of *Etudes Bibliques*.

We have no hesitation in recommending this book so carefully translated into English by the Provincial of the Friars Preachers in England. We should just like to warn those who wish to read that they must give the time and the attention which they deserve to these pages wherein "the patience of the saints" is so gloriously commended.

W.L.

*

*

*

*

SEVEN WORDS FROM THE CROSS. Lenten Meditations by the Passionist Fathers. Dublin. M. H. Gill and Son. Ltd. 55 Pages. 1947. 2/-.

"These brief meditations were broadcast from Radio Eireann on the Sundays of Lent, 1946. They are now published by courtesy of the Director of Broadcasting, Radio Eireann. In response to requests from many who heard these short sermons, they are now made available in more permanent form for a wider public". Since this little book contains seven sermons on the Passion preached by seven different Passionists, it should need no further recommendation—being the work of Specialists, it should make an immediate appeal to all. Intended for meditations and readings during Lent, it is admirably suited to its purpose, the sermons having a direct appeal and a practical application to present-day needs. Meditation on the Passion is always a fruitful source of grace, and so we recommend this book as a valuable addition to the Spiritual Library.

G.M.

THE MARRIAGE SERVICE AND NUPTIAL MASS," The Annals Office, Sacred Heart Monastery, Kensington, N.S.W. 1947. Price, 1/6.

A quite attractive little book has come to hand by this publication. It has been produced as a Souvenir Mass-Book for the Bride and Bridegroom, who have been married at Nuptial Mass.

The book resembles the usual size Prayer-book, this publication being 6ins. x 3½ins. It consists of 31 pages attractively set-up, the directions for the Married Couple being printed in red type. The various ceremonies, too, are likewise, in red.

The ceremony has been described rather well, and would prove quite comprehensible to the parties about to be married. With the use of this little book much will be derived from the great Sacrament of Holy Matrimony. Thus, will the Liturgical spirit of the Church flourish in the lives of the laity.

R.F.D.

*

*

*

*

VINTAGE, by K. M. Joyce-Prendergast. 209 pages, 5ins. x 7½ins. Gill and Son, Dublin, 1947.

As a schoolgirl wrote in a review of *The Forsaken Merman*: "The moral is, marry your own".

In this novel, a beautiful, cultured Irish girl marries unhappily an Englishman who takes her to live on his plantation in Hawaii. It is a pity for the sake of neighbourly amity, not to say of Catholic charity, that the only objectionable character in the book is an Englishman. Because of this lack of balance, Australian girls will not take to it, even if they were not put off by the highly emotional prose.

These limitations are to be regretted as it could have been a very readable work of fiction. Except for the first forty pages, until the death of the Englishman, the scene is in County Kerry among charming people whose religion inspires and informs their daily round, whether they drive through the beautiful countryside or gather for an evening of jollity.

And who would not find refreshing the thought that in at least one tiny corner of the Christian world there are attractive girls who do not have to crowd into a cinema to learn the Hollywood prescription for an interesting life?

M.O.

MY LIFE IS MINE, by Mary Beattie, Gill and Son, Dublin, 1947.

The author of this small book is evidently a teacher who knows girls well, and, because of that, is aware of the difficulties and temptations and perplexities that make the life of an adolescent such a hazardous experience. Hazardous but delightful, if only she can keep her balance. The book is very small, consisting of thirty short chapters, packed with interesting and useful advice under such headings as: "The Drinking Girl," "Worshipping Money," "Manners," "Boy-friends," "Reading." There are so many topics, all important, that in the given narrow compass, a line or so has to suffice on, say, deportment. And yet, many experienced teachers of girls think that the poised self-controlled body leads to self-respect, if not to godliness.

Not every lady will agree with the author's remarks on fashion. What looked immodest to a girl thirty years ago, is accepted to-day by her daughter without thought of sin. Nowadays a Rev. Mother puts the postulant's cap on many a sleek bobbed head that in *her* childhood would have marked the owner not many degrees from a hussy. (Bobbed heads are not condemned in this book, but there are other dislikes mentioned.)

It is the empty mind that follows the glamour magazines and that escapes from life into the shadowy comfort of the local cinema. The character then is weakened and ready for any lapse. The remedy seems to be: Give the girl an interest, a hobby, for her leisure, whether she leaves a primary or a secondary school—preferably a hobby that can be exercised at home. If this advice is mentioned in the book, it receives only a line; yet it would seem more useful than such directives as: "Don't marry a drunkard." A girl has only to see such a marriage to make her own mind about this.

But it is a book for every girl leaving school, for her mother and her teacher.

M.O.

*

*

*

*

MISS PENNYFEATHER IN THE SPRINGTIME, by Eileen O'Faolain. Browne and Nolan, Dublin, 1947.

The dearth of children's books makes this one very welcome. Beautifully written it will please adults as well as children, who will appreciate the humour of the delightful illustrations. The mixture of fantasy with everyday life reminds one of de la Mare's stories for children.

The characters in this story live by the River Lee near Cork. "If

the trees are in leaf their branches sometimes brush the tram and Mr. Richard puts out his hand and plucks a leaf and fans himself with it and throws away the leaf in some city street". Bridgie Ann is one of the characters who hold the story down to earth. Asked by Miss Pennyfeather had she no forewarning of an incident: "Oh, indeed I did, Miss", said Bridgie Ann pulling her Dream Book out of her pocket. "I always dream terribly sharp. It was as plain as the nose on your face". Two children, Stephen and Julie, thread their way among a group of lovable if fantastic men and women.

Why cannot someone dramatise a book like this for a children's session on the wireless? It would be enjoyed by children and their parents, who must listen, squirming, if they listen at all, to the pathetic screeching of some six-year-olds in a maudlin song-hit. Miss Pennyfeather in serial form would give more amusement, not to mention the dogs that race through the book—even the Dancing Dachshunds.

M.O.

*

*

*

*

THE ROAD OF EXCESS, by Terence De Vere White. Brown and Nolan, Dublin, 1947. 393 pp. 15/-.

Not many nowadays are interested in the career and views of Isaac Butt, once so well known in Ireland as a fanatical bigot, great pleader in the courts and leader of the Irish party. Mr. White's careful and distinguished biography rescues this famous figure from oblivion.

Isaac Butt descended from an English family long settled in Ireland. The name is one that led Butt's enemies to attribute strange descents to their man. O'Connell for instance, hotly contended Butt was of German origin; however, O'Connell, Mr. White points out, was most original in matters of genealogy, "and not long before he had traced Disraeli's origin to the impenitent thief". Isaac Butt was born on September 6, 1813, at Glenfin, Co. Donegal, where his father was the Protestant rector. A boy of unusual promise, he entered Trinity at the early age of fifteen. On the father's death, the family knew poverty. Butt, in fact, was poor most of his life, because in spite of his great success at the Bar, he lived a reckless life, indulging in the most expensive tastes. Butt's Trinity days were passed in the turmoil of Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill. There was no nonsense in those days, no subtle sneers, no quiet "backstairs" work, in the religious controversy. It was all in and no holds barred. The youthful Butt gave battle, draped in Orange colours, in the *Dublin University Magazine*.

More royalist than the King or Queen, Butt, in particular, was suspicious of young Queen Victoria and Lord Melbourne. "How long are we to live under a petticoatracy?" was the title of one of his articles at the time. With Butt as editor, the *Dublin University Magazine* knew literary success, attracting such promising young men as Carleton, Lever, Maxwell, Le Fanu, Lover and J. C. Mangan. Butt defended the Protestant cause, warning the British statesmen that Protestant Irishmen did not favour Repeal, but adding if the Roman Catholics were protected and fostered by England, then the Irish Protestants would support and carry Separation. He was a prominent figure on platforms which were graced by rabid and indeed, it seems, mad clergymen. Yet even at this period, Butt wrote in a strain of the starving people of Connaught in a way which showed a far more generous spirit in the orator than the usual run of his speeches and articles of this time would lead you to suspect. His heart was large, and the time would come when he would seek union among Irishmen, rather than perpetuating the old strife. He was no happy warrior. T. P. O'Connor wrote of him: "It may be that with him, as with so many others, the pursuit of pleasure was but the misnomer for the flight from despair". Melancholia was a keynote of his character to be offset by action and pleasure. In 1840, Butt made his appearance as a public man, leading the campaign of opposition to the Corporation Bill, which allowed Catholics to become Aldermen. He was defeated, but his speech before the House of Lords had the effort of causing the Duke of Wellington to show "signs of visible excitement". In the meantime, Butt had finished his legal and economic studies at Trinity. Mr. White tells a delightful story of the latter subject. When an old woman heard of the economy course she remarked that it would do Master Isaac good, provided it did not degenerate into downright *maneness*! Some of the best pages of the book are devoted to Butt's legal triumphs. He was one of those legendary figures of the old Irish Bar, whose life was passed in making passionate appeals to a jury in treason trials. With the famine, with the *Young Ireland* trials, Isaac Butt emerged from the Orange ranks to become an Irish Patriot. The acquittal of Smith O'Brien marked his advocate as one who had a great future in store. He followed up this success by obtaining the acquittal of Thomas Francis Meagher. Acquitted on one charge, these men and others of the *Young Ireland* movement were retried, defended by Butt, but sentenced to severe penalties. Butt was now on the verge of parliament. If he had listened to reason, he would have remained at the Bar, where his lucrative practice

would have removed him from the fear of his creditors. His activities in the Kirwan murder case, in the Travers action against Sir William Wilde, the Barrett and the Kelly cases are exciting. The last named was a legal triumph for Butt. Kelly shot a man called Talbot, an informer. Talbot staggered to a doctor's residence, who, with the help of two medical students, operated on the dying man. Butt disputed the fact that Talbot was a dying man and proved, to the jury's satisfaction, the guilt, not of Kelly, but of the doctor and the two medical students! Kelly was acquitted, but arrested at once and charged with firing at the police, who had run to arrest him at the time of Talbot's murder. He got twenty years, but it was a rare victory for Butt. Butt, by his defence of the Fenians, had won a leading place in the country. On the death of Moore, he became leader of the Irish Parliamentary party. If he did not invent the expression "Home-Rule", he made it a popular, powerful slogan. Home Rule and the Land Law were Butt's and his party's constant refrain. How could they get the House of Commons to consider them? By obstruction answered the rising men, Biggar and Parnell. We who live in the days of the closure and severe speakers are amused at the efforts of the ugly Biggar ("Is that a leprechaun?" Disraeli once asked) and the cold squire of Avondale. Butt was not. He said in the House he would not tolerate such tactics. From that moment, Parnell marked the old orator as one doomed to disappear from public life. His death followed quickly upon these events. Parnell has won the leading place in popular interest by his brief period of brilliant leadership, capped by the sensational and dramatic end. Poor Butt cannot cope with that. Both were of Anglo-Irish stock, and Mr. White laments the gradual disappearance of this remarkable stock. The author's comments on present day Irish politics are a matter for those who know that country well. This is an interesting book, well written. It lacks the fire of St. John Ervine's *Parnell*; Mr. White has no enemies, bar Cardinal Cullen, whose politics he detests. Everyone has an interest in Parnell, but quite a number will find interest in this picture of Ireland long ago.

T.V.

SERMON MASTERPIECES

by

THE MOST REV. TIHAMER TOTH, D.D.

(Professor, University of Budapest)

Translated by

N. G. AGOTAL,

and edited by Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D.

BELIEF IN GOD	12/3, Post 5d.
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH	21/-. Post 6d.
THE GREAT GOD	14/-. Post 5d.
THE GREAT REDEEMER	19/3. Post 7d.
THE GREAT TEACHER	15/9. Post 5d.
THE EVERLASTING	14/-. Post 5d.
THE OUR FATHER	19/3. Post 6d.
THE RISEN CHRIST	14/-. Post 5d.

Pellegrini & Co. Pty., Ltd.

543 George St., Sydney; 240 Elizabeth St., Melbourne; 370 Queen St., Brisbane;
68 Gawler Place, Adelaide; 776 Hay St., Perth.
